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Aesthetics of Sovereignty: The Poetic and Material Worlds of Medieval Jainism

Abstract
"Aesthetics of Sovereignty" explores how premodern religious communities employed narrative as a site to imagine ideal political worlds in ways that exceeded the capacity of formal philosophical and politico-theoretical discourse. Taking the Digambara Jain community of the ninth and tenth-century western Deccan as my primary focus, I argue that Jains theorized, modeled, and continually revised what it meant to be both a king and a Jain through literary and material improvisations with the narrative of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha (a genre known as the Ādipurāṇa). From the proposition that worldly sovereignty culminates in renunciation in Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa (c. 860 C.E.) and the devolution of courtly erotic love into devotional affect in Pamba’s Ādipurāṇa (941 C.E.), to the vision of an ideal king as Jain devotee in the Cāvunḍarāya Purāṇa (978 C.E.), my dissertation tracks shifting Jain experiments with language, genre, and artistic mediums that reflect broader attempts to imagine ideal worlds structured around perfected notions of worldly and spiritual sovereignty. In tracking these various Jain improvisations with the Ādipurāṇa, this dissertation demonstrates a broader Jain investment in the imaginative capacity of narrative to mediate between worldly and spiritual concerns. In so doing, I argue that Jains consistently sought to conceptually figure the worldly and spiritual, the political and religious, and even the sexual and the ascetic, as deeply imbricated social worlds rather than binaristic categories of human activity. By aestheticizing sovereignty, Jain poets created an imaginative space in which intense relations to the world could be made functional for Jain religious practice. The larger effect of this early medieval Jain political encounter, was to fundamental transform Jainism itself. What we are left with is a novel vision of Jainism: one that encourages subjects to let go of their loves only after holding onto them for a lifetime or three, one the demands renunciation of the world but only after you have conquered the eight directions as a cakravartin or sovereign emperor.
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"Aesthetics of Sovereignty" explores how premodern religious communities employed narrative as a site to imagine ideal political worlds in ways that exceeded the capacity of formal philosophical and politico-theoretical discourse. Taking the Digambara Jain community of the ninth and tenth-century western Deccan as my primary focus, I argue that Jains theorized, modeled, and continually revised what it meant to be both a king and a Jain through literary and material improvisations with the narrative of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha (a genre known as the Ādipurāṇa). From the proposition that worldly sovereignty culminates in renunciation in Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa (c. 860 C.E.) and the devolution of courtly erotic love into devotional affect in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam (941 C.E.), to the vision of an ideal king as Jain devotee in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam (978 C.E.), my dissertation tracks shifting Jain experiments with language, genre, and artistic mediums that reflect broader attempts to imagine ideal worlds structured around perfected notions of worldly and spiritual sovereignty. In tracking these various Jain improvisations with the Ādipurāṇa, this dissertation demonstrates a broader Jain investment in the imaginative capacity of narrative to mediate between worldly and spiritual concerns. In so doing, I argue that Jains consistently sought to conceptually
figure the worldly and spiritual, the political and religious, and even the sexual and the ascetic, as deeply imbricated social worlds rather than binaristic categories of human activity. By aestheticizing sovereignty, Jain poets created an imaginative space in which intense relations to the world could be made functional for Jain religious practice. The larger effect of this early medieval Jain political encounter, was to fundamental transform Jainism itself. What we are left with is a novel vision of Jainism: one that encourages subjects to let go of their loves only after holding onto them for a lifetime or three, one the demands renunciation of the world but only after you have conquered the eight directions as a cakravartin or sovereign emperor.
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NOTES ON WRITING PRACTICES

Considering that the transliteration of South Asian texts into Roman script is a central part of the study of South Asia, it amazes me that the scholarly community has not come to a greater consensus on its correct practice. This is particularly glaring in the case of Dravidian languages that contain long vowels that are present in Sanskrit, but go unmarked in the Dēvanāgari script in which Sanskrit is most commonly rendered. There are two schools of thought on this matter: one that marks Dravidian short vowels with a breve (ĕ, ő) and one that marks Dravidian long vowels with a macron (ē, ŏ). I belong to the latter school given that the Kannada script itself goes to great lengths and through various permutations to mark these long vowels. Moreover, I simply do not think that adding yet another diacritic mark is the solution to making Sanskrit and Dravidian languages mutually intelligible in Roman script. Seeing Dravidian long vowels marked with a macron (typically reserved for Sanskrit long vowels ā, ī, and ū) may be jarring to Sanskrit scholars, however, the meaning of the diacritic should be unambiguously clear. Given Sanskrit’s cosmopolitan sensibility, it is remarkable that our Sanskrit transliteration schemes are so provincial as to resist adaptation to other South Asian languages regardless of their Indo-Aryan or Dravidian origins.

The following dissertation considers the Ādipurāṇa textual tradition that spans the Sanskrit and Kannada languages in the medieval western Deccan. The authors writing in this genre saw Sanskrit and Kannada Ādipurāṇas as part of the same literary continuum. This emic perspective simultaneously saw Sanskrit as a cosmopolitan language capable of speaking beyond the boundaries of place, but, at the same time, a profoundly regional
practice. Sanskrit was and continues to be written in the Kannada script and the spelling of Sanskrit words reflects the expanded scope of this script (rather than the more limited alphabetic range Dēvanāgari). As such, while the pronunciation remains the same, unmarked long vowels (o, e) in Dēvanāgari are rendered long in Kannada usage. For example, we find the Sanskrit poet Jinasena spelled as Jinasēna, Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amoghavarṣa rendered as Amōghavarṣa, and yoga as yōga.

More complicated to handle are Sanskrit words that are spelled differently in Sanskrit and Kannada. This phenomenon is particularly apparent with ē and ā ending Sanskrit words that are rendered in Kannada in the final position as i and e respectively. For example, the divine dancer is Nilāñjanā in Jinasena’s Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa and Nilāñjane in Pampa’s Kannada version. This is further complicated given that in Kannada the compounded word takes the original Sanskrit ending (i.e., Nilāñjanā). I defer to Kannada spellings in these instances as well. I realize that this practice may again appear perplexing to Sanskrit scholars, however, I think it is important to begin to think of Sanskrit as an intrinsic part of Dravidian languages and literatures as reflected in the practice of writing. I consider the rendering of Sanskrit through the parameters of Kannada to be an important first step in thinking about the translocality of Sanskrit as a language that is paradoxically regionally produced and locally imbricated.
### ABBREVIATIONS OF FREQUENTLY CITED TEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Ranna’s <em>Ajitapurāṇaṃ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cāvuṇḍarāya <em>Purāṇaṃ</em> (Triṣaṣṭiśalākapuruṣapurūṇaṃ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Epigraphia Carnatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GĀP</td>
<td>Guṇabhadra’s <em>Ādipurāṇa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Mahāvīrācārya’s <em>Gaṇitasārasaṃgraha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUP</td>
<td>Guṇabhadra’s <em>Uttarapurāṇa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td><em>Indian Antiquary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK</td>
<td><em>Inscriptions of Karnataka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td><em>Jayadhavaḷā prāṣasti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KED</td>
<td>Ferdinand Kittel’s <em>Kannada-English Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td><em>Karnatak Inscriptions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JĀP</td>
<td>Jinasēna’s <em>Ādipurāṇa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKI</td>
<td>Jinavallabha’s <em>Kurkyāl Inscription</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Jinasēna’s <em>Pārśvābhuyudaya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PĀP</td>
<td>Pampa’s <em>Ādipurāṇaṃ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Ponna’s <em>Santipurāṇaṃ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td><em>South Indian Inscriptions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAV</td>
<td>Pampa’s <em>Vikramārjunavijayaṃ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Śivakōti’s <em>Vaḍḍārādhane</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

1. Prologue

In the summer of 2009, I went to Karnataka, India for the first time to study on the AIIS Kannada program in Mysore. One of the program’s field trips was to the Jain pilgrimage site at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa in Hassan District. I was excited to visit this place given that, up to that point, one of the only books I had read about Karnataka was S.Settar’s *Inviting Death: Historical Experiments on Sepulchral Hill*, which details Jain activity at the site as early as the seventh century, when it served as a place where Jain monks and nuns would ritually fast to death in a practice called *sallēkhanā*. When we got to Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa we first went to the small hill, strewn with *niṣadhi* memorials marking the sites of ritual deaths. This landscape and the religious world that it evoked neatly aligned with what Settar had described. Next, we went to the larger hill where I was confronted with one of the most astounding images that I have ever seen. Towering fifty-seven feet high in glistening gray granite was a nude male monolithic statue with flowering creeper vines climbing its legs and snakes and anthills encircling its feet. Who was this figure? What would prompt someone to erect such an image? For whom was he such a compelling figure, and why? This moment was the start of my dissertation research.

About the monolith, I quickly learned that it was an image of Bāhubali, the son of Ādinātha, the first perfected being of the Jain tradition, who is locally known in the Kannada and Tulu speaking regions as Gomaṭa, Gommaṭa, Gommaṭēśvara, Gummaṭa,
Gummaḍa, and Gummaḍe.¹ The monolith was commissioned by the Western Gaṅga general Cāvuṇḍarāya and consecrated in 981 C.E.² This initial act of patronage was quickly followed by further royal largesse from the Gaṅgas, Hoysaḷas, Woḍeyars, and the Vijayanagara Empire; their donations funded worship of the image and the construction of large temple complexes on both hills. The history of the monolith, its patronage, and its worship, alongside the site’s earlier significance as a place for the practice of ritual death, is neatly accessible in volume two of the Epigraphia Carnatica series, edited by B.L. Rice starting in 1889. All of the other volumes in this series cover the inscriptions of an entire district (Coorg, Hassān, Kaḍur, Mysore, and so on); only the second volume on Śravaṇa Belgoḷa is dedicated to the inscriptions of a single site. This density of epigraphical material surrounding the Bāhubali monolith and Śravaṇa Belgoḷa more broadly speaks to its enduring historical, political, and religious significance. A rich and complex history unfolds in these sources. However, from the inscriptions of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, I was only able to glean for whom this statue was important—kings, queens, merchants, military generals, and other medieval and early-modern elites connected with royal dynasties or mathas (for lack of a better word, monasteries)—but they failed to reveal anything about the figure of Bāhubali himself or what would compel someone to build a giant stone statue in his image. To build off the inscriptive record, I had to expand the purview of my research. Jain literature was the obvious place to turn.

¹ Gummaḍa and Gummade are names for Bāhubali specifically used in the Tulu speaking regions of the south-western Deccan. Heidrun Brückner, On an Auspicious Day, at Dawn... Studies in Tulu Culture and Oral Literature (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 41.
² Cāvuṇḍarāya is also rendered as Cāmuṇḍarāya, Ėvaṇḍarāja, and Cāmuṇḍarāja.
Jainism has long been on the margins of the study of South Asian religion. While that can be problematized from any number of angles, the medieval Deccan is an example of a time and place where Jainism is anything but marginal. Apart from the Śaiva poet Koṇḍaguli Kēśirāja Daṇṇāyaka’s Śīlamahatvada Kanda, Ṣaḍakṣara Kanda, and Mantramahatvada Kanda (c. 1110 C.E.) and the smarta brahman poet Rudrabhaṭṭa’
Jagannāthavijayam (1180 C.E.), one is hard pressed to name an author in either Sanskrit or Kannada who was not a Jain until well into the thirteenth century. Indeed, Jain authors, intellectuals, and poets penetrated the elite echelons of the Deccani courts to such a degree that they became the predominant literary class from the ninth to the twelfth centuries. It was to this body of literature that I turned to in my quest to more fulsomely understand the dynamics of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgaḷa. Upon closer investigation, I discovered that the popularity of this figure in stone also extended to the literary sphere where his story as the kingly son of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha is narrated in a literary genre called the Ādipurāṇa (The First Purāṇa or the Purāṇa of Ādinātha). Within the ninth to tenth centuries alone, at least, four versions of the Ādipurāṇa were composed in Apabhraṃśa, Kannada, as well as Sanskrit and in the styles of court poetry (kāvya), mixed meter and verse (campū kāvya), and prose (gadya/vacana). As I delved into both the material and literary archives that predate the initial monolith, the framing of my initial questions became increasingly problematic for

3 Within this same span of time we also find Puṣpadanta’s Mahāpurāṇa or Tisaṭṭhimahāpurisagunalaṅkāra in Apabhramśa. Despite its relevance to the ninth- and tenth-century Deccan, this text proved to be outside the possible scope of this dissertation. In its exclusion, I have unintentionally reproduced the binary between Sanskrit and vernacular languages (e.g. Kannada) that Prakrits and Middle Indic languages problematize. In turning this dissertation into a book, I plan to include a chapter on Puṣpadanta’s Mahāpurāṇa.
their exclusive focus on Bāhubali. In reading these texts, I realized that the popularity of Bāhubali, in both text and in image, is just one articulation of a much broader medieval Jain investment in kingship and sovereignty captured in the Ādipurāṇa. This genre of Jain writing and its related artistic improvisations are the focus of this dissertation. The circuitous route through which I arrived at this topic is unfolded in a much more linear fashion in the following pages in which my starting point, Bāhubali, is transformed into the culmination of a sustained study of Jain sovereignty.

In taking the Digambara Jain community of the ninth- and tenth-century medieval Deccan as my primary focus, this dissertation considers the case of a medieval religious extremist political project, as captured in the Ādipurāṇas of this period. Through close readings of these texts, I argue that Jains theorized, modeled, and continually revised what it meant to be both a king and a Jain through literary, material and visual improvisations with the Ādipurāṇa narrative. In this always-ongoing process, Jains focused on the king and the court as sites through which to theologize the political. Capturing the broader religious ethos of the moment, in his Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa (860 C.E.), the poet Jinasēna imagines kingship and spiritual sovereignty as hierarchically adjacent through the radical proposition that kingship properly lived culminates in renunciation; true sovereignty is found in spiritual liberation. Although the lithic records attest to a few kings who did, in fact, renounce, this larger proposition—let alone the difficult task of persuading kings of its merits—prompted Jain poets to play with the trope of kingship in different, although related, ways.⁴ For example, Pampa’s Kannada

⁴ Burton Stein, “All the Kings’ Mana: Perspectives on Kingship in Medieval South India,” in Kingship and Authority in South Asia, ed. J.F. Richards (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 148-149.
Ādipurāṇaṃ (941 C.E.) explores the textured and complex emotional worlds of the court and the king to propose an ontological connection between erotic sexual love and religious devotional love. Cāvuṇḍarāya’s version of the Ādipurāṇa narrative in his Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣapurāṇaṃ (978 C.E.; hereafter Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ) takes up the theme of devotion and proposes that an ideal king is a Jain devotee. In their shifting vision of an ideal king—from one who relishes and then renounces to one who becomes a devotee—and through their co-optation of the idiom of kingship as a metaphorical logic through which to figure the Jain telos of liberation, these various aesthetic modes of religious improvisation illuminate how medieval Digambara Jains shaped and were shaped by the institution of Indian kingship. I argue that medieval Jains sought to posit religious and political spheres in a stadial narrative of spiritual progress: ideal Jain practices of worldly kingship gave rise to true kingship, the spiritual sovereignty of liberation.

2. An Emic History: The Coming of Digambara Jainism to the Western Deccan

Before jumping into the specifics of my archives and attendant arguments, I begin with a background discussion of Digambara Jainism, its connection to the western Deccan, and its proximity to political power. The Jain tradition broke apart into two distinct sects called the Digambaras and the Śvētāmbaras in approximately the mid-fifth century C.E. This schism emerged out of a set of disagreements over monastic dress and practice (the word Digambara itself describes the sect’s monks as “sky-clad” or nude while the word Śvētāmbara describes the monastic practice of wearing white garments), the women’s potential for liberation (Digambaras were against it and the Śvētāmbaras for it), and the contents of the Jain scriptures (Digambaras believed the scriptures to lost or
corrupted beyond measure while the Śvētāmbaras maintained that the fourteen central
Pūrva texts were no longer extant, but the twelve aṅgas and upaṅgas were preserved).
This summary distillation of a much larger set of disputes would set these two Jain sects
on quite radically different paths in terms of gender dynamics, monasticism, ritual
practice, socio-economic status, among many others. Furthermore, these two sects took
root in different parts of India and, in engaging with the world around them, they were
further shaped by the cultural, religious, and linguistic milieus of those locales. Both
Śvētāmbaras and Digambara Jainism are deeply embedded within the cultural fabric of
western India, and, in particular, in contemporary Rajasthan and Gujarat. Whereas
another branch of Digambara Jainism became associated with South India and, most
intensely, with the western Deccan. While part of the Jain tradition, Deccani Digambara
Jainism might be best understood as more in conversation with the Deccani-based
Vīraśaiva tradition than its Śvētāmbara counterparts in west India. Even the divide
between west Indian and Deccani Digambara communities is quite notable, thereby
reflecting these traditions as regional articulations of a larger pan-Indian tradition.5

In contemporary India, Jainism is most immediately associated with wealthy
Gujarati mercantile communities and scholarship has tended to reproduce these sectarian
and regional biases.6 If the Jains are marginal to the study of South Asian religion and

5 John Cort takes up the question of the role of regional culture in shaping religious
traditions in his chapter “The Jina as King.” In this same piece, he also problematizes
what little scholarship there has been on the Digambara tradition tends to treat it as a
unified whole rather than regionally differentiated. John E. Cort, “The Jina as King,” in
Vasantagauravam: Essays in Jainism, ed. Jayandra Soni (Mumbai: Vakils Feffer &
Simons, 2001), 27.
6 P.S. Jaini unpacks the history of western scholarship’s Śvētāmbaras focus in his chapter,
“The Jains and the Western Scholar,” in Collected Papers on Jaina Studies (Delhi:
Digambara Jainism even more so, Kannada and the Kannada-speaking region are equally ignored within the broader field of South Asian Studies. The Deccani Digambara Jains are left out on all counts. Beyond such scholarly lacunas, there is downright ignorance surrounding the origins of Jainism in the Deccan and, perhaps even more interestingly, there is little awareness about the historical and political claims that this particular Jain community makes about its spread to the region. Most scholars of South Asia are intimately familiar with the close connection between the Mauryan Emperor Aśōka and Buddhism as famously expressed through his edicts scattered across the subcontinent. However, scholars will be less familiar—in large part due to the fact that the majority of the relevant materials remain untranslated—with the connection between Aśōka's grandson Samprati Candragupta and the origins of Jainism in the Deccan.

An undated Sanskrit inscription from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa—on paleographic grounds possibly dated to 600 C.E.—is likely the first account of the spread of Jainism to Karnataka facilitated by the last Śrutakēvali Bhadrabāhu, the last Jain monk to retain a grasp of the entirety of the fourteen Jain Pūrva texts. The inscription narrates at length

---

7 At the risk of reductionism, the only scholar of the Kannada speaking region with whom most academics are familiar is A.K. Ramanujan whose volume Speaking of Siva remains one of the best and singular translations of the Vīraśaiva Kannada vacanas.


9 Epigraphia Carnatica Vol. 2, no. 1, 115-116 (English), 1 (Kannada), 1 (transliteration). All references are to the old series unless otherwise noted. For more on Bhadrabāhu see
how Bhadrabāhu foresaw a famine that would devastate the city of Ujjain (modern day Madhya Pradesh) for twelve years. In order to survive, Bhadrabāhu migrated south with part of the Jain Saṅgha where, along the way, he sensed his impending death. He stopped at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, dismissed the rest of the saṅgha, and meditated to death. According to this inscription, his sole attendant was his disciple Prabācandra. But who was Prabācandra? Unfortunately, he leaves no trace in any other record. One reading of the pairing of Bhadrabāhu and Prabācandra, first generated by the epigraphist B.L. Rice who edited and published this inscription, makes sense of this unknown moniker as the clerical name for Samprati Candragupta Maurya (321-296 B.C.E), the first emperor to at least notionally unite the subcontinent.¹⁰ Rice's reading harmonizes this early inscription with later inscriptions and literary versions of the southern migration narrative that inextricably bound the Jain monk Bhadrabāhu to the Emperor Candragupta.

The remaining four relevant inscriptions at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa describe Bhadrabāhu's attendant not as Prabācandra, but simply as Candragupta. Within the lineage portions of inscriptions (sampradayas), Candragupta as preeminent Jain disciple becomes standardized as one of Bhadrabāhu's distinctive features vis-à-vis other monks within the tradition; Candragupta is Bhadrabāhu’s claim to fame so to speak. For example, an inscription from 1128 C.E. at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa describes Bhadrabāhu as "stout of arm in subduing the pride of the great wrestler of ignorance, through the merit obtained from discipleship of Candragupta was for a long time served by forest deities."¹¹ Another very similar inscription from the same site dated 1163 C.E. states, "His disciple

¹⁰ EC Vol. 2, no 1, 115, f.6.
¹¹ Ibid., no. 53, 135 (English), 49 (Kannada), 36 (transliteration).
was Chandragupta whose glory was such that his gaṇa of munis was worshipped by forest deities."\(^{12}\) Finally, in an inscription dated to 1433 C.E, we get the following account of Bhadrabāhu, "His disciple was Chandragupta, a chief among the gods in the possession of all goodness, the greatness of whose penance caused his exalted fame to spread into other worlds."\(^{13}\) The centrality of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta and their connection to Śravaṇa Belgoḷa is further built into the very landscape of that place. The small hill is named Candragiri after Candragupta. In the substantial temple complex located on this hill, the oldest temple dated to the ninth century is similarly named the Candragupta Basaḍi. A cave also on Candragiri contains a pair of carved feet with the following inscription dated to 1090 C.E., "At Śri-Bhadrabāhu svāmi's footprints Jinachandra bows in reverence."\(^{14}\) In the medieval Jain imagination, Śravaṇa Belgoḷa was the site at which Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta took refuge.

Just as Candragupta's discipleship became a standardized feature of Bhadrabāhu's inscriptive biography so too did this pair's presence became a quality of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa itself. And the connection between these figures and this place happened relatively early within the larger inscriptive realm of southern Karnataka. We find two notable inscriptions both dated to the ninth and tenth centuries in Maṇḍya District. At Pāṇḍavapura, we find the following description of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa as "...the assembly of śravaṇas dwelling at Belgoḷa which is attached to the holy place Kaḻbappu, an ornament to the world, its broad summit marked with the footprints of the great munis Bhadrabāhu

\(^{12}\) Ibid., no. 40, 121 (English), 11 (Kannada), 8 (transliteration).
\(^{13}\) Ibid., no. 108, 166 (English), 113 (Kannada), 81 (transliteration).
\(^{14}\) Ibid., no. 71, 150 (English), 81 (Kannada), 61 (transliteration).
and Candragupta.”

Similarly, an inscription on the island of Śrīraṅgapatṭaṇa states, "the Kalbappu hill on the broad summit of which is the mark of the honored feet of the chief sages Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta.” From inscriptions spanning as early as 600 C.E. to 1433 C.E., Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta are bound together in the insessional record, rarely do we get one without the other, and their activities are specifically tied to Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa. While not a single one of these inscriptions mentions the Mauryas, the Jain tradition has long understood the disciple Candragupta to be Emperor Candragupta Maurya.

Indeed, beginning in the early medieval period, Digambara Jains began to narrativize the origins of Jainism in the Deccan as coextensive with the Maurya Empire and, in particular, one of its most prominent emperors, Candragupta. Beyond the five inscriptions at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa that make reference to Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta and two other inscriptions in Manḍya District, the first extant literary record of Bhadrabāhu's migration occurs in the Jain Sanskrit work the Brhatkāthakōsa by Harisēna dated to 931 C.E. The story also occurs in Śivakōṭi's Vaḍḍārādhane composed in Kannada somewhere between the ninth and eleventh centuries. Then we have Ratnanandi’s Bhadrabāhucarita composed in Sanskrit in 1450 C.E. Finally, there are two later Kannada

---

15 EC Vol. 6 [New Series], Pp. no. 16, 493-494 (English), 114 (Kannada), (no transliteration). Note that Kalbappu is an archaic name of Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa.
16 Ibid., Śr. no. 85, 639 (English), 410 (Kannada), (no transliteration).
17 In the medieval Deccan, the Digambara Jains were not the only community invested in Emperor Candragupta Maurya. Rice notes that the Gutta dynasty styled itself as the “Candraguptavamśa,” “Candraguptānvaya,” and “Candraguptamahārājādirājakula.” EC Vol. 2, Introduction, 13. In addition, Barnett notes that this dynasty also traced its lineage from the Guptas and, in particular, Vikramāditya of Ujjain. Lionel Barnett, “No. 37—Gadag Inscription of the Reign of Jayasimha II: Saka 959,” Epigraphia Indica Vol 19, 218.
18 In this text, Bhadrabāhu dies at Ujjain rather than Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa.
versions: the *Munivamśābhyudaya* in 1680 C.E. and Dēvacandra's *Rājāvaṭikathe* in 1838 C.E. Other than the *Bhadrabāhucarīta*, what is notable about this group of texts is how the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta narrative appear within a collection of stories. In this broader textual context, the story of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta is transformed into a cycle or episode, among a larger collection of episodes that narrate the history of Jainism, both in a pan-Indian and very localized South Indian sense. This particular narrative cycle took on a great importance for how the Digambara tradition understands its origins as well as providing a possible historical explanation for how the Digambara and Śvētāmbara sects came to be divided. The centrality of this historical narrative cycle is evidenced by its continual textual production and reproduction in literature up until the early modern period.

Here, I focus on Śivakōṭī's *Vaḍḍārādhane*, in part because it is the earliest version found in Kannada, but also because more than the other available versions the *Vaḍḍārādhane* locates the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta cycle within the broader context of the Mauryan Empire. For instance, it is the only version of the narrative that refers to Candragupta by his full name Samprati Candragupta. But first, a bit about the text. Śivakōṭī's *Vaḍḍārādhane* and Cāvuṇḍarāya's *Trīṣaṭiśalākāpurusapurāṇaṃ* (henceforth *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ*) are both commonly cited as the "first" extant piece of Kannada narrative prose writing. Both of these texts were produced in the same tenth- to eleventh-century time span in a more Dravidian style of Kannada prose than was current in the campū dominated court circles (a topic further explored in my fifth chapter). However,

---

19 Raidhu, a sixteenth-century north Indian Digambara poet, also produced the *Bhadrabāhuṇakyanacakandraguptakathānaka* in Apabhraṃśa that is exclusively focused on the story of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta.
20 *VĀ*, 61.
the Vaḍḍārādhane is more accurately described as a Kannada commentary and prose summary of a Jain Prakrit ārādhane text—most likely Śivakōṭi’s Bhagavatī Ārādhana—whose gathes (Skt. gāhās) are given at the head of each of its eighteen chapters. While there are many scattered references to early Jain Kannada commentaries, especially surrounding the Digambara secondary canon of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama and the Kaṣāyaprābhṛta, the Vaḍḍārādhane is the earliest extant example of Jains putting Kannada to use for religious purposes. Beyond its formal function as a commentary, that is, the glosses of individual Prakrit words in Kannada, the text also contains elaborate summaries of the contents of these Prakrit verses.

Śivakōṭi’s Vaḍḍārādhane shares much in common with the story of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta that can be pieced together from the inscriptional record. However, in a more expansive narrative context, the story unsurprisingly becomes more detailed and elaborated. The narrative begins with the child Bhadrabāhu, son of King Padmaratha and

21 Many questions arise about the Vaḍḍārādhane from its date, to its title, and even its author. A.N. Upadhye dates the lower end of the Vaḍḍārādhane to 898 C.E., but ultimately settles on an eleventh-century date of production. A.N. Upadhye, “Brhat-Kathākośa,” in Upādhye Papers (Mysore: Prasaranga, University of Mysore, 1983), 59. Manuscripts of the Vaḍḍārādhane bear no clear title and have no clear author. K.B. Pathak and J.F. Fleet first called the text Upasargakevaliṅga Kathā of Revākotyācārya, however, over time and with very little evidence in support the text became attributed to Śivakōṭi under the title Vaḍḍārādhane. Ibid., 53. The likely explanation for these attributions derive from the root text that this Kannada text comments upon, namely the eighteen Prakrit gathas (numbers 1539 to 1557) of Śivakōṭi's Bhagavati Ārādhana. Here we have a case of an exegetical apparatus being confused with its root text.

22 My own sense of this history is counter to Pollock's model of Kannada as the exemplary vernacular language that follows his model of a regional languages transformed into literary languages through a Sanskrit. Rather, I suspect that Kannada largely emerged as a language of scriptural commentary. Śivakōṭi's Vaḍḍārādhane is our earliest extant trace of this alternate linguistic history.

23 These prose summaries bear much in common with a later genre of Kannada Jain writing called nōmpikathes, or what we might call in English "exemplary tales," that narrate the stories, religious practices, and deeds of famed Jain ascetics and laymen.
Queen Padmaśri of Kaṇḍinī, being taken under the tutelage of the Jain monk Gōvardhana. The text then shifts to a different scene of Emperor Aśōka, away in battle, directing his ministers via letter to hire a teacher to educate his son Kuṇāḷa. The ministers misconstrue the letter and blind the young prince and feed rice to the teacher. Luckily, the aggrieved King quickly is borne another son named Samprati Candragupta. The infirm Kuṇāḷa becomes a Jain monk while Candragupta is destined to rule the empire. During Candragupta’s rule, Bhadrabāhu comes to a park in Ujjain where Candragupta pays him homage. Shortly after this, Bhadrabāhu prophesies the onset of a twelve-year drought that will ravage north India and make it impossible for Jain monks to maintain their vows. The very same night—in the volta of the text—Candragupta experiences a set of sixteen strange dreams that Bhadrabāhu interprets as follows:

On account of seeing the setting sun, the bearers of the fourteen Pūrva texts who possess clairvoyant knowledge will not appear here in the Bharata land. On account of seeing the splintering branch of a wish-fulfilling tree, when this very day has passed, crowned kings—great due to the power of their families—will no longer become ascetics. On account of seeing aerial cars come to the world and return upwards, the Vidyādhara gods will not come from there to this land. On account of seeing a twelve-hooded snake, there will be a fierce famine for up to twelve years from now in this land. On account of seeing a broken moon, a profusion of grass will grow in the crop of formerly correct dharma. On account of seeing two roiled elephants approaching each other to fight and then recoiling, it will not rain enough to please the people. On account of seeing a worm used for catching fish, the fourteen branches of knowledge will exist outside of the aṅga texts and the śāstras will become similar to a worm; only a mere moment of teaching will be accessible. On account of seeing the middle of a tank without water, the land of Madhyadēśa, which produced the Tīrthaṅkaras and the Cakravartins, will not prosper. And, on account of seeing a forest-fire rising up with increased enmity, wicked rogues will thrive. On account of seeing a monkey ascended to the royal throne, those opposed to the śāstras will be victorious through violence and become great by opposing the correct dharma of kings such as compassion. On account of seeing a dog eating rice pudding off a golden plate, heretics will be honored by kings. On account of seeing a monkey

---

24 VĀ, 60.
25 Ibid., 61-62.
26 Ibid., 67-68.
ascended on the back of an elephant, princes will serve under men of low birth. On account of seeing a lotus growing in a heap of rubbish, princes and the wealthy will abandon the path of true religion and those of low birth and poor families will follow. On account of seeing the ocean stray past its shore, the children of kings will go beyond the boundaries of propriety. On account of seeing a white donkey yoked to a golden chariot, those on the path to liberation will be ruined and become deluded by the pleasure of physical experience. On account of seeing kings mounted on white donkeys, members of good families will marry those of low birth.27

Upon hearing Bhadrabāhu's foreboding interpretation of the coming events, Candragupta

---

27 ādityan astamānakke salvudam kāṇḍaṇāndri bharataśṣētradol caturdāṣapūrvadhārīgālum avadhījānīgālum illindittā āgar kalpavṛskada kōḍūtiḍudumāṃ kāṇḍudarjaṇi indina divasaṃ kāḷidode kulabalivhaṅgadim piriyar aparasugal mukutabaddhar appa tampamāduvar allār nelake varuttirā vimāṇam eḍeyindam mēge magulyaṃ kāṇḍudarjaṇi dēvarkaṃ vīyādharaṃkalum illindittī kṣētrakke bārār panneraṇḍu taleyā pāvaṃ kāṇḍudarjindillīṃ tōṭī nāḍol panneraṇḍu varṣam baregaṃ raudrapasavam akkuṃ candran oḍedudam kāṇḍudarjim saddharmadā moda pordida mārgadim beleyoḷ pulgal palavakkuṃ kāḍuḍiyavapperaṅgagāl tammoḷ pōral sārdū perapiṅguvudam kāṇḍudarjim prajegala meccidante malē kollāv manḍalavarṣam akkuṃ mīnambuluvāṃ kāṇḍudarjim mīnambuljavīnōl orānauvā sāṅtraṅgālum āṅgabāhyam appa caturduṣvādyāsthānāṅgālum kundiyupadēṣatanumātrame nilkum nir illa keṛeya nāḍuvāṃ kāṇḍudarjim tīrthāṅkaraṇaṅgālīgala puṭṭha madhyādēśadōḷ pinna nāgalēyaṇagadu ... endu madhyādēṣapramānām mattām pageyindam percī negeda kāḻkircam kāṇḍudarjim dhūrtar appa pollaliṅgālīgala perakkum mattaṃ daye māḷāgī oḍeyā saddharmakke viruddhamāṅg negalva piridappā himsādīgālāṃ geyya vēḍḍiśāṅtraṅgala perakkum simhausanaman ēgirda kōḍagamāṃ kāṇḍudarjim kulajar alladavar arasugeyvar ponnataliṅgeyoḷ nāya tūyala nūnbadaṃ kāṇḍudarjim pollaliṅgālīgak arakalindam pūjipadē kōḍagam āṇeyān ēṟuvudam kāṇḍudarjindaṃ ānuṃ sūdhakuladōḷ puṭṭi darasumakkal uṭtamakuladōḷ appa bhīmānamāṃ toṛedu bāḷkāṇam āgi kulajar alladavargāḷ āgi bāḷr kusakuppeyoḷ tāmāre mūḍudam kāṇḍudarjim dayeyupaṣamamāṃ pariprahaṇaparīyaṃ samādhiyam satyamāṃ šauchamāṃ kṣameyum endivu modalāgodeyavaṇaṃ kūḍīa mikka saddharmāṁgamaṃ dravyapatīgalum arasumakkalum tamma dravayaṇi madadindam toṛevaṁ nīcajātiṃ galum bāḍavaraṃ saddharmamaṃ kāṇḍudarjim negalvar samudrānā thāngappuṉudam kāṇḍudarjindam arasumakkal tamma mārūvaṇi mikka dravyaṇi modalāgodeyavaṇaḷ lōabhēṣṭhar appar oḷḷitappa satyaṇaḥcācārītravendīvaṇaḷ kundiyādām ānuṃ nīrdayarkaḷ appar belgāḷa pūḍīda ponnarathanamaṃ kāṇḍudarjindam

samagdarśanasāṅcācārītrāṅgalindam pavitraṃ appa nirgānthaliṅgām appudan alidōḷitappa tappaṃ kaiṅke pāṭṭaṃ pūrdaṃ puruṣakārāṃ satyamāṃ manōbalumāṃ vīryamāṃ endivārindam kūḍīdavargālindam oḷḷilidārī appa tīrthakaraṇapadēvarkalindam cakravartgilindam caramadeḥadhārīgālindam negalē pāṭṭudam oḷḷitappā mōkṣamārāṇaṃ poṛdiyam viṣayasukhanāḷoḷ mōhitarkalāgī kiḍuvart belgāḷeyan arasarkalē ēṟuvudam kāṇḍudarjindam uttamakuladavargāḷe kulajar allade avarōḍane maduveloy. VĀ, 68-69.
renounces. He crowns his son Simhasēna king and becomes Bhadrabāhu's disciple.

Together with Candragupta, Bhadrabāhu gathers all the eight thousand monks from that region and leads them south. A separate set of monks led by Rāmila, Sthūla, and Sthūlabhadra remain in the north in the Sindhu region. While on the southern path (*dakṣiṇamārga*), Bhadrabāhu senses his impending death and sends the *saṅgha* to the Draviḍa country under the guidance of the monk Viśākha. The sage Candragupta remains with Bhadrabāhu at Kaḻbappu Hill where the latter begins fasting to death. Meanwhile, Candragupta goes begging in the forest where he is given food by forest deities (an image also found in the inscriptionsal record at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa). Bhadrabāhu dies and is reborn as Amitakānta in the Brahmakalpa Heaven. Candragupta remains at Bhadrabāhu’s death memorial worshipping, performing penance, and breaking his fast with food again offered by the forest deities. Meanwhile, the monks who had gone to the Draviḍa country under Viśākha return to Madhyadēśa after the famine has ended. On the way, they stop at Kaḻbappu Hill to pay homage to Bhadrabāhu's shrine. They advise Candragupta to refrain from taking food and to commit *sallēkhanā*.

The narrative then picks up with the other band of Jain monks who had remained in the north in the Sindhu country. Under famine conditions, they broke their vows and begged for food at night, ate during the day, and began wearing a loincloth—a set of practices that break with the orthopraxy of the Digambara tradition. When the Sindhu branch is reabsorbed into the Draviḍa branch of monks, they re-adopt the proper practices of itinerant begging and nudity. However, the group of monks under the guidance of Sthūlabhadra retains the loincloth (*ardhagappada*). Eventually, these half-clothed monks transition to wearing a long white garment. The story ends with the death of Samprati.
Candragupta on Kaḻbappu hill through the practice of sallēkhanā. He is then born as a Śrīdhara god in the Brahmakalpa heaven.

There are many notable features of the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta narrative cycle as it appears in Śivakōṭi’s Vaddārādhane. For one, the text exhibits a deep, if somewhat convoluted, familiarity with the Mauryas. The story starts not with Candragupta, but with the famed emperor Aśōka. In this telling, Aśōka is Candragupta's father and the blind Kuṇāḷa is his brother. While the individuals and their names are all correct, the genealogy conflicts with what we know of Maurya history drawn from their inscriptions. In actuality, Aśōka had a blind son named Kuṇāḷa who, in turn, was the father of Samprati Candragupta. Nevertheless, what is significant here are the ways in which this text singles out the Mauryan dynasty as a narrative tether and attempts to approximate the historical temporality of the Mauryan rulers. But where did Deccani Digambara Jains writing in the tenth century get access to such a history of the Mauryas? Largely encompassed by the state of Karnataka, the western Deccan has the highest concentration of Aśōkan edicts of any modern Indian state.\(^\text{28}\) These edicts, scattered throughout the subcontinent, were “discovered” by Alexander Cunningham in the mid to late nineteenth century and were subsequently published in the first volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum in 1877. The connection between these inscriptions and their wide geographical spread were central to early theories of the Mauryans as the “first” Indian empire, a topic that has preoccupied Euro-American and Indian nationalist history writing from its near inception. The recognition of the importance of the Mauryan Empire
is conceived of as a thoroughly modern (or, at least, colonial) phenomenon. To my knowledge, no scholar has explored the historical awareness of the Mauryan Empire possessed by premodern inhabitants of South Asia. Scholars have tacitly assumed that the epigraphical skills and historical sensibility required to read and interpret the Aśōkan inscriptions are the products of nineteenth-century Indology. The Vāḍḍārādhane and its related inscriptions suggest that Deccani Digambara Jains had access to Aśōkan inscriptions—even if they somewhat rewrote the chronology to their own literary ends—and understood the significance of the Mauryan imperial formation. They also suggest that this community of Jains recognized the advantages of history writing as a tool to be in proximity of political power. Or, as Ronald Inden might describe it, “the capacity of people to order their world.”

The Vāḍḍārādhane illuminates a tradition of premodern South Asian historiography routed through epigraphical materials that was unmediated by nineteenth-century Europe. Such emic historiographical traditions were functionally illegible to Orientalist scholars who simply assumed they did not exist.

Early medieval Jain preoccupations with the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta

---

29 Ronald Inden, Imagining India (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 1.
30 If the Vāḍḍārādhane suggests that Jains were reading Aśōkan inscriptions then the narrative of the Vāḍḍārādhane can also be productively used to reread the inscriptive record at Śravaṇa Belgola. Two inscriptions there inexplicably mention the presence of "forest deities" in connection with Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta. The Vāḍḍārādhane makes this connection explicit; namely, Candragupta survives in the jungle for twelve years after Bhadrabāhu's death through the largesse of forest deities. Another moment where the Vāḍḍārādhane illuminates an inscription relates to the female Jain devotee fasting to death and uttering the names of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta as exemplary Jain models of sallēkhanā. No extant inscriptions make mention of Candragupta as fasting to death, however, the narrative culmination of the Vāḍḍārādhane is Candragupta's sallēkhanā. All this suggests that more elaborate versions of the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta narrative cycle circulated orally and would have provided the broader context to the inscriptions at Śravaṇa Belgola. Moreover, it seems likely that the Vāḍḍārādhane drew its material from these oral narrative traditions.
narrative did not simply remain in the inscriptive and literary realms, but also became the subject of a singular and exceptional piece of Jain narrative art. Jain art in the Deccan is not typically known for its narrative quality. Rather, Jain figurative art tends to be freestanding sculpture of the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras and attendant deities under worship in temples or as relief sculpture found in caves. Similarly, friezes decorating the exteriors of Jain temples largely consist of flora, fauna, and images of Jain Tīrthaṅkaras and goddesses largely devoid of narrative context. An exception to this is a set of two narrative panels that narrate the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta story built as screens in front of three goddess shrines in the Candragupta Basaḍi at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷ (Figs. I.1 & I.2). To my knowledge, this story appears nowhere else in the entirety of Jain art. The panels are not original to the structure and were likely added anywhere from the tenth to the twelfth centuries. Beyond their unusual content, the panels bear the signature of their artist, Dāsōja in Haḷe Kannaḍa script in the middle of the left panel (Fig. I.3). Signed art is relatively uncommon in premodern South Asia. However, in this case, we also find an artist working under the name at the not too distant Hoysaḷa capital of Dōrasamudra in the twelfth century, suggesting that Dāsōja was an artist active in this time and region. The dating of Dāsōja and his screens to the twelfth century aligns with other Hoysaḷa art found in the temple, including the guardian deities that flank the inner sanctum.

Each screen bears forty-five narrative scenes perforated with blank openings to let light into the inter sanctums of the goddesses. The narrative unevenly snakes in an "s" pattern from the top of the panels to the bottom, legible through the orientation of the figures feet (Fig. I.4). The narrative commences on the left top corner with Candragupta’s homage to Bhadrabāhu, Bhadrabāhu teaching to the court, Candragupta’s sixteen dreams,
the southern migration, Candragupta's attendance at Bhadrabâhu's death, the migration of the Draviḍa group of monks back north, and Candragupta's death by sallēkhanā. Much like the volta of the text, the elaborately carved scene of Candragupta's dreams is centered at eye-level on the left panel, providing the narrative incitement for all the scenes that follow. My impulse here to compare the screen with textual versions of the Bhadrabâhu and Candragupta narrative might feel like a recourse to the primacy of text to image. However, in this particular context, I would argue that the screens function as the culmination of a larger narrative tradition first established in inscriptions, elaborated in literature, and then rendered beautiful in visual art. Indeed, the complexity of the screens and their close adherence to the narrative found in Śivakōṭi’s Vaḍḍārādhane suggests that the screens were sculpted with access to the more complex textual versions of the narrative.

What are we to make of all of this narrative material spread across a variety of artistic and cultural mediums? Beginning in the ninth century and stretching to the twelfth century, the pairing of Bhadrabâhu and Candragupta and the more elaborate version of the story in which they appear crystallized across inscriptive, literary, and art historical materials. Allowing for outliers, the vast majority of this material was produced when Jains were at the zenith of their power in the western Deccan. Indeed, prior to the twelfth century, in a phase typically termed the "Jaina period," there is very little record of any widespread organized religious movement beyond Jainism. Jains used the Bhadrabâhu and Candragupta southern migration as a way to describe the origins of Jainism in the region. Such an investment in origins is part of a larger project of collective self-fashioning that sought to position Jainism as dominant within the
historical, political, and religious landscape of the Deccan. The timing of this is not incidental, I argue that the appearance and cultivation of the Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta narrative cycle occurred at a moment when Jains were attempting to marshal history to stabilize their own position within the Deccan and to re-iterate their natural alliance with political power.

The archives we do have from this early period, particularly within the literary sphere, are predominately Jain. In the absence of other perspectives that enliven, complexify, and flesh out a positivist historical reading, such a homogenous archive is quite literally an archive of aspirations; we see the early medieval Deccan as Jains wanted it to be seen. This is not the first archive of aspirations that we will encounter in this dissertation (I take this up further in chapter one). Indeed, Jains were keen to capture the predominant historical narrative and put it to their own ends. This poses a problem of interpretation: what do we make of the fictions and fictive readings that such an archive produces? My practice in this larger dissertation is to take seriously the liberal mixing of fact and fiction that comprises a certain set of Jain materials. A set of aspirations itself can be read as a certain type of historical fact. If we take these aspirations seriously, not as describing the world, but describing it as a community would like it to be, what do those aspirations tell us about the Jain community from this period? For example, the putative intimacy between Jainism and the Mauryan Empire is almost certainly little more than a foundational fiction, but the fact that beginning in the early medieval period Jains began to narrativize the origins of Jainism in the Deccan as coextensive with the Mauryan empire illuminates Jain attitudes towards political power and their desire to be in proximity and intimacy to it. Moreover, these materials show us that Jains themselves
were invested in the question of history and the ways that history can be written to one's advantage.

On the surface, the story of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta appears to have little to do with the narrative of first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha in the Ādipurāṇa. However, I begin with this historical and archival anecdote about the coming of Digambara Jainism to the Deccan because it neatly connects several themes that animate this dissertation. How and when Jainism made its way to South India has yet to be robustly explored or explained, but it appears that there were likely several different movements south: to the Tamil speaking regions, on the one hand, and to the western Deccan, on the other. The Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta narrative, then, gives an emic account of the origins of Digambara Jainism in the Deccan that presages and undergirds the later rise of Jainism in the region that forms the focus of this dissertation. This story also captures a key element of this dissertation and medieval Deccani Jain materials more broadly; from the beginning, Digambara Jains always sought to position and imagine themselves in proximity to political power. The narration of Jainism’s arrival in the Deccan as co-extensive with the Mauryan Empire and, more specifically, the claiming of a king as Jain, in this case Candragupta Maurya, are reduplicated in the ninth-century court of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarśa explored in the first chapter. Jain investment in specific kings—be it Candragupta, Amōghavarṣa, or later with the Paramāra King Bhōja and the Kalacuri King Bijjala—is paralleled by theoretical explorations of ideal kingship and sovereignty in the genre of the Ādipurāṇa. That is to say, Jains intervened into the historical imagination of South Asian kingship, but also engaged in broader debates on the constitution of ideal rule. It is no coincidence that central to the story of the southern
migration narrative is King Candragupta’s renunciation of his kingship. The theme of royal renunciation is a major trope in Digambara Jain literature including the Ādipurāṇa narrative.

Finally, spanning literary, material, and visual culture, the diverse archive of materials surrounding Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta speak to the ways in which Jains consistently turned to a wide range of artistic mediums to forward their historical, political, and religious aims. We find this too in the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa whose themes and characters are taken up in art, epigraphy, and literature. On the relationship between artistic mediums, Eugene Wang says, “Texts and images are discussed not merely for the sake of elucidating each other; they combine to work toward the reconstruction of the larger picture of a perceptual field.”31 This statement proves helpful in thinking about the interpenetrated quality of the multiple artistic mediums that together suggest the existence of a Jain aesthetic and theoretical field engaged with the relationship between kingship and renunciation. My overarching methodology is sensitive to the various interactions between visual and textual culture, the referential ways that visual culture shapes and fashions textual culture and the manner in which texts are read and enacted in visual culture.

3. “Toward a Minor Literature”

The Ādipurāṇa, the biography of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha, emerged as a distinctly Digambara literary tradition starting with the first extant version in Sanskrit by

Jinasēna in the ninth-century court of Rāṣṭraṅga king Amoghavarṣa. In brief, the narrative traces the trajectory of Ādinātha’s soul through a series of rebirths culminating in his eleventh and final birth as the first Tīrthaṅkara of the Jain tradition. Ādinātha does not move through transmigration alone, but rather his soul is embedded within an interconnected group of souls who are born alongside him in each rebirth—although the gendered, familial, and social specificity of their relationships is transformed in each succeeding iteration. In tracking Ādinātha’s soul along a continuum of moral development—of which his last and final birth is the pinnacle of human perfection—the narrative also attends to the ups and downs in the moral development of the larger group of main characters or, more precisely, main souls. What stands out among this series of Ādinātha’s rebirths are his repeated incarnations as a king, each of whom, after a period of time, renounces his kingdom. The Ādipurāṇa narrative returns us time and again to the question of what it means to be an ideal Jain king. With great narrative consistency across

---

32 This Jinasēna (sp. Jayasēna) who authored the Ādipurāṇa should be differentiated from the Jinasēna who authored the Harivamsapurāṇa. From chapter sixty-six verse thirty-six, we are told that Jinasēna I was the disciple of Kīrtisēna, who was, in turn, the disciple of Amitasēna. Together they belonged to the Punnāṭa Gaṇa. According to the text, Jinasēna I’s Harivamsapurāṇa was composed in 783 C.E in modern day Gujarat. R.B.P. Singh, Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975), 9; John E. Cort, “An Overview of the Jain Purāṇas,” in Purāṇa Perennis: Reciprocity and Transformation in Hindu and Jaina Texts, ed. Wendy Doniger (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 191; and Upadhye, “Brhat-Kathākośa,” 103. On Harisēna and the Punnāṭa Saṅgha, Upadhye says "Punnāṭa-viśaya or the territory of Punnāṭa, according to Hariṣeṇa himself, is to be located in the Dakṣināpatha or South India.” (Nos. 131, 40, 13.5.1); and from earlier discussions it is clear that it is to be identified with one of the ancient kingdoms of Karnāṭaka, through which flowed Kāveri and Kapinī, the capital of which was Kīrtipura or the present Kittur on the Kapinī, and which lay to the south of the present Mysore state including the Heggaḍḍevanakoṭa and other Tālukas in it. The Punnāṭa-samgha must have derived its name from this territory.” Ibid., 104. On the importance of Puṇṇāṭa as a medieval Jain site in the Mysore area see Desai, P.B. Jainism in South India and Some Jain Epigraphs (Solapur: Jain Samskriti Samrakshaka Sangha, 2001), 47.
Sanskrit and Kannada, such Ādi stories circulated as individual, self-standing narratives called Ādipurāṇas and as the first and longest chapter of the Mahāpurāṇa, a type of universal history that details the lives of the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition (triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣa). Within the larger Mahāpurāṇa genre, the expanded and densely detailed story of Ādinātha acts as a template for the remaining twenty-three Tīrthaṅkaras whose own life stories are told in a much more abbreviated fashion. The Ādipurāṇa, as its name suggests, is the purāṇa of Ādinātha as well as the first (ādi) or ur-purāṇa of the entire Jain tradition.

Jinasēna composed the first extant Ādipurāṇa in highly stylized Sanskrit court poetry (mahākāvyā). Jinasēna's pupil Guṇabhadra later wrote the biographies of the remaining sixty-two heroes, which together with Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa created a complete Mahāpurāṇa. Jinasēna wrote at a moment when Jain literati affiliated with Amōghavarṣa’s court adopted Sanskrit as a language of intellectual and literary expression. Indeed, I argue that by the ninth century, Jain literati had come to recognize the power of language, literary expression, and aesthetics as political instruments in their own right. This makes sense given the fact that the emergence of aestheticized courtly artistic forms—be it ballet, drama, or poetry—expressed and augmented political power in the larger premodern world. In the context of South Asia, Sheldon Pollock has notably argued that the particular aesthetic capabilities of Sanskrit made it a successful tool for the expression of political power that enabled its geographical spread.33 Probing the tautological quality of Pollock’s argument, Daud Ali has pushed back by asking what,

precisely, is the nature of power to which Pollock refers.\textsuperscript{34} My own reading of Jinasēna and Jain Sanskrit more broadly suggests that there is nothing inherent to Sanskrit that enabled it to become the predominant expressive medium of political power across South and Southeast Asia, which it undeniably was. No language is inherently more special (read: aesthetic) than another; rather, it is what people do and imagine that they can do with language that empowers it.\textsuperscript{35} In the case of Sanskrit, what my work demonstrates is that the collective, translocal recognition of Sanskrit as a tool of political empowerment gave it its power, or enabled the production and reproduction of certain “aestheticized” forms of power. Power, in this sense, relies upon collective participation and investment in fantasies of empowerment that are then made real through iteration upon reiteration. Therefore to understand Sanskrit and its relationship to power requires that we attend to the individuals and the communities who produced and reproduced Sanskritic norms and values. The Jains, and Jinasēna in particular, were one such community and one such individual.

Jinasēna and his Ādipurāṇa produced and were produced by this distinctive moment of the ninth century in which Deccani Digambara Jains briefly embraced Sanskrit kāvya as a potent tool for political expression. Yet, the Jain kāvya from

\textsuperscript{34} Daud Ali, \textit{Courtly Culture in Early Medieval India} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 18.
\textsuperscript{35} As Bourdieu observes, “The legitimate language no more contains within itself the power to ensure its own perpetuation in time than it has the power to define its extension ins pace. Only the process of continuous creation, which occurs through the unceasing struggles between the different authorities who compete within the field of specialized production for the monopolistic power to impose the legitimate mode of expression, can ensure the permanence of the legitimate language.” Pierre Bourdieu, \textit{Language and Symbolic Power} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 58. South Asian Studies has paid scant attention to the struggle between groups in the production of Sanskrit as a cosmopolitan or, in Bourdieuan terms, legitimate language. The Jain community was one such group.
Amōghavarṣa’s court and even Jain kāvya more broadly never registered—or perhaps did not register in the same way—within mainstream channels of Sanskrit literary criticism and production. For example, Jain kāvya is rarely if ever cited in Sanskrit aesthetic or literary theory. In contrast, Buddhist kāvya, from which the earliest extant examples of kāvya are drawn, received far more attention in Sanskrit literary circles than Jain authors writing in the same genre. This is even more peculiar considering that Jains produced far more kāvya over a greater expanse of time. Nonetheless, the fact of the matter is that Jain Sanskrit poetry is rarely cited, praised, or emulated by poets or critics who were not themselves Jain. Given this point, what do we get by reading Jain Sanskrit kāvya such as Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa?

If Deccani Digambara Jains recognized Sanskrit as a tool of expression to reach outside of their community, then, in some ways, they largely failed; it is not clear if anybody on the outside ever read any of it. Rather than thinking of this as a “dead end,” I propose instead that we think of this period as a literary “threshold.” Digambara Jain poets are not cited in Sanskrit literary theory nor emulated by great poets, but their presence still reverberates and shapes what we think of as the Sanskrit tradition itself. For

37 There are, of course, exceptions to this rule. For example, Yigal Bronner notes that the Digambara Jain poet Dhanañjaya (who was also likely from the western Deccan) was praised by Rājaśēkhara and Bhōja as well as being possibly known by Kavirāja. Bronner further observes that Dhanañjaya’s Dvisandhānakāvya “was primarily read in the Jain milieu of the Deccan, where the manuscripts, commentaries, and most references to the text are found.” Yigal Bronner, *Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement of Simultaneous Narration* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2010), 104.
example, the first extant reference to Kālidāsa, the preeminent poet of the classical Sanskrit tradition, occurs in the Aihoḷe inscription in which the Jain poet Ravikīrti compares himself to Kālidāsa and Bhāravi while, at the same time, imitating Kālidāsa’s *Raghuvaṃśa*. Moreover, the text of Kālidāsa’s *Meghadūta* was originally reconstructed because its incorporation in Jinasēna’s *Pārśvābhuyadya*. We have further references to the lost Sanskrit commentary on the fifteenth *sarga* of Bhāravi’s *Kīrātārjunīya* by the Western Gaṅga Jain King Durvinīta (r. 529-579 C.E.), as well as many examples of both Śvētāmbara and Digambara Jain commentaries on the *Meghadūta* and other *mahākāvyas* such as Śrīharṣa’s *Naiṣadhīya*. It is not particularly surprising then that the very first reference to the four poets whose poetry comprises the five great *mahākāvyas* (pañcamāhākāvyas) of the Sanskrit tradition was by the Jain poet Munibhadrasūri in his Śāntināthacarita (1354 C.E.), or that the Jain maṭhas of the Kannada speaking regions are filled with these non-Jain *mahākāvya* texts. One could argue that, positioned on the outside looking in, Jains were uniquely situated to identify, emulate, and perhaps even create the classical Sanskrit tradition as we know it. This thread runs further through Digambara Jain Kannada poetry in which poets bound themselves to classical Sanskrit poetry by translating these works into Kannada, as we see with Cauṇḍarāja’s
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40 See *The Meghadūta: As Embodied in the Pārśvābhuyadya with the Commentary of Malinātha Arranged Accordingly and a Literal English Translation, Various Readings, Critical Notes, and an Introductory Essay Determining the Date of Kālidāsa From the Latest Antiquarian Researches* (Poona: 1894).
41 King Durvinīta is mentioned in the *Kavirājamārgaṃ* as a poet in his own right. *KRM*, v. 1.29. His court was influenced by Jainism and the Jain monk Pūjyapāda is said to have been his personal guru. B.A. Saletore, *Mediaeval Jainism: With Special Reference to the Vijayanagara Empire* (Bombay: Karnataka Publishing House, 1938), 19-29.
Abhinavadaśakumāracarite and Nāgavarma I’s Karṇāṭaka Kādambari, which respectively rework Daṇḍin’s Daśakumāracarita and Bāṇa’s Kādambari. Kannada poets and theorists like Nāgavarma I in his Chandombudhi followed their Sanskrit predecessors in referencing Kālidāsa, in particular, as an object of comparison, thereby elevating him to the preeminent poet of the Sanskrit tradition. This process occurred alongside a project of commenting upon and rewriting the canon of Sanskrit poetry, a canon that had solidified very early in the minds of Jain Sanskrit and Kannada poets.

This Jain project of imagining and producing the classical Sanskrit tradition simultaneously produced what Deleuze and Guattari call a “major literature,” in which the form and content of writing are produced within a pre-established framework of poetic possibility in a language that is “determinatorialized.” In contrast, for Deleuze and Guattari a “minor literature” is not, as one might expect, a literature composed in a vernacular or regional language, but is rather “that which a minority constructs within a major language.” If Jains imaginatively identified and reproduced a major literature for themselves in the Sanskrit tradition, then they simultaneously produced a minor literature in their adoption and use of Sanskrit kāvya for religious and political ends. Of course, Deleuze and Guattari’s focus on German novels, short stories, and letters of the Czech author Franz Kafka does not completely map onto the literary landscape of the early medieval Deccan (the centrality of national consciousness, revolution, and Kafka’s own focus on bureaucracy are just a few examples that are out of place in premodern South Asia). However, their first two points about minor literature bear repeating. Minor literatures 1) adopt major languages and use them in novel ways and 2) are always

43 Deleuze and Guattari, Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature, 21.
44 Ibid., 16.
The Jain literature produced in and around the ninth-century court of King Amōghavarṣa exemplifies this understanding of a minor literature in the ways that it mobilized Sanskrit for specifically Jain religious ends and, in so doing, created an imaginative space in which Jains could propose ideal political worlds. In focusing on such a minor literature, the question then becomes: how do you let the minor stay minor? That is to say, the scholarly imperative is to argue for the centrality of our subjects to the world they inhabited. Otherwise, what is their value?

Minor literatures, I suggest, archive the spirit of an historical moment, dreams of unrealizable futures and worlds that never came to pass. They are interesting in and of themselves for that future. In the case of Deccani Jain Sanskrit, if we stick with Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of a minor literature, we see how the failed political aspirations of a minor literature are sustained and reimagined in new literary and linguistic sites. The ninth-century flourishing of Jain Sanskrit production in Amōghavaṛṣa’s court was something of a flash in the pan; it lasted a mere century if that. Indeed, as quickly as Jains turned to Sanskrit in the ninth century they abandoned it in favor of Kannada in the tenth century, thereby elevating the local vernacular of the western Deccan into a literary language. If, in the ninth century Jains began to recognize language as a central tool of political expression, then their early embrace of Kannada makes a great deal of sense. The Jain Kannada authors who predominated in the courtly circles of the tenth to twelfth century Deccan wrote in a hybrid style of language almost akin to later manipravala, a form of writing that mixed Sanskrit with Tamil. It is not a stretch to say that Deccani Jain Kannada authors were still writing in Sanskrit, albeit a Sanskrit with Kannada case and
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verbal endings, suggesting that perhaps the development of South Asian languages fundamentally expands the concept of minor literature. Indeed, I would argue that this early period of Kannada literature was but a further Jain attempt to marshal the power of Sanskrit to their own ends. There is literary historiographical evidence to support such a reading. Jain Kannada poets regularly invoked Sanskrit poets alongside Kannada poets as literary models. In fact, there is very little evidence if any at all that suggests that Jain poets viewed Sanskrit and Kannada literature as discontinuous.

The proposition that Kannada literature emerged out of and continued a linguistic investment first established by ninth-century Jain Sanskrit literature is something of a novel reading, a reading that requires further refinement given that Kannada itself became a major literature in a Deleuzian sense. If, as I have argued, the reception of Jain Sanskrit literature was largely limited to the Jain community itself, Jain Kannada literature became foundational for a much wider and diverse literary and linguistic tradition. Jain Kannada poets employed a highly Sanskritized Kannada literary register and almost exclusively composed in the distinctive campū kāvya genre of mixed prose and verse. This Kannada Jain style was mimicked by non-Jain authors such as the Kamme Brahmin author Dārgaśimha in his Pañcatantraṃ (1025 C.E.), the Vīraśaiva poet Harihara in his Girijakalyāṇam (1165 C.E.) and the smarta Brahmin author Rudrabhatta in his Jagannāṭhavijayaṃ (1180 C.E.). This formative Jain influence in the emergence of Kannada was never forgotten, elided, or problematized as it was in the case of Tamil and perhaps even Telugu.46 Put plainly, Kannada speakers never excised Sanskrit and, by

extension Jainism’s early influence, from their language; the minor literature of Jain
Sanskrit literature continued to exist within the major literature of Jain Kannada
literature. What I have attempted to track in this section is the connection between elite
and vernacular languages and literatures, in this case Sanskrit and Kannada, as
interrelated not just in linguistic terms, but as produced through a larger Jain literary
project. Deccani Digambara Jain literary activity across Sanskrit and Kannada mounts a
serious case for the central role of religious communities in cultivating languages in ways
that exceeded theological concerns but are nonetheless irreducible to flatly secular aims. I
now turn to a consideration of what those aims might be.

4. The Figure of the King as the Object of an Historical and Literary Analysis

While Jain Kannada literati saw themselves as intimately connected to an earlier
Jain Sanskritic tradition, that connection is most palpably expressed through the genre of
the Ādipurāṇa. Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa stands out as an inaugural and influential piece of
Jain Sanskrit kāvya and it is no coincidence that the very first example of available
Kannada poetry is Pampa’s campū kāvya Ādipurāṇaṃ in which he invokes Jinasēna as a
source of inspiration. The narrative of the first Tirthaṅkara Ādinātha continued to
command attention as the first and most substantial chapter of the Cāvuṇḍarāya
Purāṇam, considered to be a likely candidate for the first piece of Kannada prose writing.
What was so compelling or captivating about this narrative that it was rewritten and
reworked in a variety of languages and genres? Or, what would prompt a poet to turn to
the narrative of Ādinātha when writing in a new language or in cultivating a new genre?
In this dissertation, I argue that the Ādipurāṇa was a politically potent narrative through
which Jain literati theorized the relationship between mundane power and sovereignty on
the one hand and the Jain religion on the other. The connection between the literary and linguistic history of the ninth- and tenth-century western Deccan explored above and this genre is important to specify; as Jain poets discovered in Sanskrit and later in Kannada a tool of political expression so too did they discover in the Ādipurāṇa genre a vehicle for political theorization, a site in which to imagine the ideal constitution of Jain kingship.

Previous English language scholarship on Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa is somewhat limited while scholarship on Pampa and Cāvuṇḍarāya’s versions of the narrative is virtually non-existent. The most substantial piece of writing produced on Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa is Ralph Strohl’s dissertation “The Image of the Hero in Jainism: Rṣabha, Bharata, and Bāhubalī in the Ādipurāṇa of Jinasena.” Strohl focuses on the dispute over royal succession between Ādinātha’s two sons Bāhubali and Bharata after their father has renounced his kingdom.47 Rather than come to blows and spill blood on the battlefield as in the Mahābhārata, this fraternal dispute is resolved in a nonviolent fashion. In light of this, Strohl reads Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa as a retelling of the Mahābhārata routed through Jain ethics that emphasizes heroism devoid of violence.48 Anne Monius and Indira Peterson have similarly highlighted a broader Jain preoccupation with heroism in which martial language and metaphors are transposed from military combat against an enemy to bodily combat against karma (that, in some instances, was absorbed in medieval South Indian Śaivism).49 Relying on a similar reading practice, in his article “The Digambara Jain Warrior,” Paul Dundas replaces hero with warrior to make a similar argument

48 Ibid., 23-24.
What all of this scholarship captures is the martial metaphors central to Jain ontology and soteriology. My work takes up this point, but further argues that Jain conceptions of heroism, warriorhood, and militant combatancy derive from a larger project surrounding worldly and bodily sovereignty and, by extension, notions of mundane and spiritual kingship.

The centrality of kingly characters in Jinasena’s Ādipurāṇa is significant, but not at all unexpected. The importance of kings within the Jain tradition has been widely noted. John Cort and Alan Babb have both examined how Śvētāmbara ritual culture is permeated with royal language, visuality, and materiality. Babb’s seminal volume *Absent Lord: Ascetics and Kings in Jain Ritual Culture* explores the metaphors of kingship at play in Śvētāmbara Mūrtipūjaka ritual culture. He keenly observes, “Martial values, albeit in transmuted form, are crucial to Jainism’s message and to its understanding of itself. The Jina is a conqueror. He is also one who might have been—had he so chosen to be—a worldly king and a conqueror of the world. Instead, the Jina becomes a spiritual king and transposes the venue of war from the outer field of battle to an inner one.” Similarly, in his chapter, “The Jina as King,” John Cort observes that “By choosing victory over karmic bondage in the spiritual realm rather than victory over
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52 This is a sect of Śvētambara Jainism that, as implied in the name *mūrtipūjaka*, worships images.
mortal enemies in the worldly realm, the Jina chose lordship over the three worlds that constitute the entire cosmos rather than lordship over the single human world.”

What Babb and Cort point to is the fact that Tīrthaṅkaras or Jinas are would-be worldly kings who reach a higher kingship in the form of liberation through martial inspired practices of asceticism. Through iconographic elements including the lion throne (simhāsana) and umbrella (chattra) employed by both Śvētāmbaras and Digambaras and more explicitly crowns in the case of the Śvētāmbaras, Tīrthaṅkara images are worshipped as spiritual kings.

The topic of kingship writ large has long endured as a site of academic focus within the study of South Asia. This vast body of scholarship is largely invested in the figure of the king. Yet he is elusive to the point that Burton Stein once asked, “Will the real, or true, Indian king please stand up?” If we imagine a king standing in a hall of mirrors, this scholarship captures the multiplicity of images and reflections produced through refraction. We see the king as a divinely sanctioned cosmic ruler onto which Buddhism, Śaivism, and Vaiṣṇavism, and to a lesser extent Jainism are graphed on to as a

54 Cort, “The Jina as King,” 43.
55 The central point here is that Jinas are worshipped in temples as other-worldly kings rather than mundane kings. That is to say, Jinas are always depicted in their liberated post-renunciation form. There is one exception to this; within Śvētāmbara Jain art of west India there exists a somewhat peculiar and problematic style of image called living lords (jīvantavāmi) in which the Tīrthaṅkara—typically the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvira—is depicted prior to renunciation as a prince. Describing one such image, John Cort states, “Ringlets of hair cascade onto the shoulders, indicative of the status of a householder, not a renouncer who has shorn or torn out his hair. It is ornamented with a broad necklace, and upper and lower armlets, also indicative of royalty. Around its waist and falling to its ankles is a pattern cloth.” John Cort, Framing the Jina: Narratives of Icons and Idols in Jain History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 161.
57 Stein, “All the Kings’ Mana,” 133.
language of power.\textsuperscript{58} He possesses the status of the universal sovereignty or a cakravartin—both in a Buddhist and pan-Indian sense—signaled by the auspicious symbols on his body.\textsuperscript{59} The king is also recognizable through a symbolic vocabulary of language and objects that mark his status as a king such as his tropic marriage to the goddess Śri and possession of a white umbrella. \textsuperscript{60} Embedded within a hierarchy and in relationship to other kings, he aspires to possess greater and greater sovereignty as expressed through ranked titles such as rāja (king), ādirāja (supreme king), and rājādirāja (supreme king of kings).\textsuperscript{61} The king appears as the embodiment and upholder of kṣatriya dharma.\textsuperscript{62} He is beholden to the ritual power of his Brahmin minster and locked into an unbreakable cycle of gift exchange.\textsuperscript{63} We see him at the center of a ritual economy in which the kingdom is made and remade through elaborate royal rituals, but he also appears at the center of the ritual culture of the court.\textsuperscript{64}
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\textsuperscript{58} Inden, Imagining India, 165.


\textsuperscript{61} Ali, Courly Culture in Early Medieval India, 33-34.


the world, he is also always posed on the precipice of renunciation.\textsuperscript{65} He is a despot within a Machiavellian political system focused on the administration of the state.\textsuperscript{66} He is an archetypical lover who relishes in the sumptuary world of the court.\textsuperscript{67} As the pinnacle of the court complex, he is the progenitor of kāvya or court literature and the object of its glorification as well as its hapless hero dependent on the wherewithal of his sidekick, friends, and ministers.\textsuperscript{68} At the same time, he is the preeminent donor and devotee of the medieval Hindu temple complex.\textsuperscript{69} When we add locality to this picture, we find further regional iterations of kingship: the Rajput king, the South Indian king, and so on.\textsuperscript{70} In these various guises, he moves and changes across sources from the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, to the purāṇas, in the śāstras of the trivarga (of dharma, artha, and kāma), kāvya, and in epigraphy.\textsuperscript{71}

Daud Ali has importantly challenged the centrality of the king and kingship in our analysis of the historical nexus of the court, imperial polity, and power in medieval South Asia. He argues that while there was an in increasing fragmentation and regionalization (as inherent in the notion of the “medieval”), regional polities were united by shared ideas of universal overlordship, on the one hand, and a common investment in a sumptuous courtly culture, on the other. Ali artfully shows us how medieval South Asian

\textsuperscript{66} Heesterman, The Inner Conflict of Tradition, 131-132.
\textsuperscript{67} Shulman, The King and the Clown, 303 and 324-325.
\textsuperscript{68} Indira Peterson, Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic: The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 10; Shulman, The King and the Clown, 168.
\textsuperscript{70} Bose, Royal Umbrellas of Stone, 21; Shulman, The King and the Clown, 11.
\textsuperscript{71} For a good overview of sources on kingship, see Charles Drekmeier, Kingship and Community in Early India (Stanford University Press, 1962).
courts spoke the same language of power, one that exceeded the figure of the king. Perhaps responding to a critique of his own book, *Courtly Culture in Early Medieval India*, that it elides regional complexity and specificity of individual courts in favor of an ideal-typical model, Ali has recently remarked, “What has been lacking, particularly among Western Indologists, is an understanding of Hindu Kingship as a historically constituted and changing set of ideas and practices that must be placed against wider historical processes, social, economic, and religious.” What Ali is calling for here is historical sensitivity and specificity. The Jains of the ninth- and tenth-century Deccan—situated as they were in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire and affiliated feudatories of the Eastern Cāḷukya and Western Gaṅga courts—provide important insight into the production of courtly literature on the one hand and a situated regional conception of kingship on the other. Both perspectives illuminated by this archive highlight the centrality of Jainism in literary and political culture of this time and place.

5. Politicizing the Theological: Mundane Sovereignty, Spiritual Sovereignty, Self-Sovereignty

Deccani Digambara Jain literati were deeply interested in the question of proper kingship and sovereignty and its relationship to Jainism. At its core, the Ādipurāṇa genre is an assessment of sovereignty: its proper dominion, practices, and outcomes. While each author examined in this dissertation improvises with the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa at the level of language, genre, and aesthetics as well as at the level of affective emphasis, narrative pacing, and character formation, they also share in a basic set of assumptions about mundane sovereignty, spiritual sovereignty, and self-sovereignty. In unpacking and tracking the ways in which Jains mobilized sovereignty across multiple spheres of human
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experience, we can start to see how Jains engaged with established understanding of kingship and sovereignty in ways that made them uniquely their own.

From Bodin’s concept of absolute sovereignty to Foucault’s understanding of askesis and the government of others, sovereignty names a wide variety of political and discursive phenomena. It is not a stable concept that can be neatly deployed in a premodern South Asian context. Indeed, there is no precise definition of this term in Euro-American materials; it is always inchoate and in motion. Similarly, there is no neat definition of sovereignty in Sanskrit or Kannada. The term most frequently used to name sovereignty is the word rājya, which when used as an adjective translates to “kingly” or “royal” and when used as a noun connotes “kingship,” “sovereignty,” and “empire.” As such, rājya contains within it the mundane reality of a king (rāja) ensconced in his kingdom (rājya) as well as a more abstract notion of authority that, as we will see, can be appropriated to describe other, non-courtly forms of power. Rather than adopt a definition derived from a different context, I attempt here to come up with my own definition of sovereignty drawn collectively from the Ādipurāṇas analyzed in this dissertation.

Starting in Jinasēna’s Sanskrit version, the Ādipurāṇa tradition begins to imagine kingship as a physical weight born by the body. In a poignant verse describing the baby Prince Puṇḍarīka being crowned king, Jinasēna says:

Here we have the kingdom of the Cakravartin.
There we have a feeble child.
That being the case, we have an unbroken bullock yoked to a weight that should be carried by a bull.73

The image of the kingdom as a weight or a burden gets taken up and formalized in

\[
\text{kva cakravartino rājyaṁ kvāyaṁ bālo atidurbalaḥ |}
\text{tadayāṁ puṅgabairdhārye bhare damyo niyojitaḥ || JĀP, 8.96.}
\]
Kannada as a turn of phrase to describe the passage of the kingdom from a father to a son. The “kingdom” (rājya) or the “earth” (vasundhara or dhara) is described as a “weight” (bhāra) that is “entrusted” to (nīrisu), or literally “established” upon, the heir apparent. The weightiness of the kingdom, found throughout Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ, is picked up and similarly utilized in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ with slight verbal modification. The image of the kingdom as a physical object seems to be a specifically Jain transformation of the Buddhist notion of the cakravartin in which the chariot symbolizing the world only moves forward when its two wheels—the wheel of law turned by the cakravartin and the wheel of dharma turned by the Buddha—are properly functioning. Both images of a Jain king bearing the weight of the world on his shoulders and the Buddhist cakravartin as a wheel bearing the weight of the world as a chariot share in the irreducible materiality of kingship. Both Jain and Buddhist kings are yoked to their worldly kingdoms.

The image of the kingdom as a physical burden borne by the body is conceptually linked to one aspect of Jain sovereignty: it is an embodied practice of authority. Sovereignty as authority is expressed through legitimating fictions of auspicious physical marks on the body, the possession of symbolic symbols (the umbrella, etc…), and the practices of sexual and sumptuary excess. Here sovereignty is something borne by, acted out upon, and enacted by the body. A second aspect of sovereignty is performed through forms of rule. In the Ādipurāṇa sovereignty is not typically depicted through the

---

74 In the PĀP see rājyabhāradoḷ niṟisi (v. 2.49); rājyabhrāramaṃ niṟisi (4.67 vacana); dharābhāradoḷ niṟisi (v. 5.27); and vasundhārābhrāramaṃ niṟisi (v. 6.36). In the CP see rājyabhāra niṟisi (18); ātaṅge dharābhāramam koṭṭu (27); and rājyabhāramaṃ koṭṭaḍe and rājyabhāra appaisi (94).
75 Strong, The Experience of Buddhism, 82-83.
arts of governance; we rarely see the kings of the Ādipurāṇa engaged in the nitty-gritty mundane realities of royal administration. Instead, sovereignty as rule is typically expressed through symbolically charged ritual practices including the abhiṣēka, digvijaya, and hōma rituals. We recognize a king not through administrative practice, but through symbolic rituals that assert a right to rule. It is through these two modalities as authority and rule that sovereignty functions in the Ādipurāṇa tradition. Embodied authority and forms of rule sanctioned through ritual produce a form of mundane sovereignty in which the king has command over others, namely his subjects.

Starting in the third chapter, this dissertation begins to explore how Jain poets sought to position kingship and renunciation as hierarchically adjacent spheres of activity. One clear way in which this positioning occurred was through the adoption of the language of kingship as a metaphorical logic through which to figure renunciation, Jain ascetic practices, and, ultimately, the telos of liberation. The appropriation of the language of mundane kingship to describe such religious practices yields a new figure; the spiritual king or sovereign. If the mundane sovereign is married to Rājyalakṣmi, the goddess of prosperity personified as the kingdom, then a spiritual sovereign or soon to be liberated soul is married to Muktilakṣmi, the goddess of prosperity personified as liberation. This parallelism between the mundane king and the spiritual king is sustained throughout Jinasēna and Pampa’s Ādipurāṇas, in which these two forms of sovereignty are compared, contrasted, and, ultimately, assembled into a hierarchy with
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76 The one major exception to this rule is Ādinātha’s response to a devastating drought that kills off the wish-fulfilling trees on which the people of the world are reliant. He establishes three lower castes (ksatriya, vaiśya, and śūdra) along with their hereditary occupations. When Bharata takes over his father’s throne he establishes the brahman caste.

77 JĀP, v.11.47.
spiritual sovereignty superseding mundane sovereignty as the more enduring form of power. The metaphorical collapse between mundane and spiritual sovereignty has a number of conceptual consequences that reflect how Jain literati understood the relationship between the two. In Jainism, all bhavyas, or souls with liberatory potential, have the capacity for liberation. However, to be born as a king itself suggests a soul’s moral progression on the path to liberation. In their past lives, kings have done something karmically advantageous to warrant birth as a king; kingship itself is already a privileged ethical position. However, there is something deeper that goes untheorized within the tradition that is active in this literature, the qualities and skills of a good king alongside the experience of kingship itself specifically predispose these figures to renunciation and, by extension, liberation. A king married to Rājyalakṣmi will inevitably desire Muktilakṣmi. As much as a mundane king and a spiritual king are oppositional figures, their shared vocabulary of power suggests that they are not so much opposites, but rather figures along the same moral continuum to which the language of power equally applies.

While the repurposing of the language of political sovereignty to describe Jain religious practice produces the figure of the liberated spiritual sovereign, it also opens up a space for a new worldly figure, a self-sovereign. The self-sovereign cares not for mundane sovereignty as authority and rule, but is instead engaged with sovereignty as spiritual authority and ascetic forms of rule. His authority is similarly embodied through auspicious marks on the body, the possession of symbolic symbols (the umbrella, etc…), and the practices of celibacy and austerity. The self-sovereign’s domain is his own body, his enemy combatants are karma, and his military might takes the form of asceticism. Even while inhabiting the vocabulary of kingship, self-sovereignty then is the negation of
mundane kingship and, as we will see, is rightfully borne by one who has forsaken kingship like the would be king Bāhubali. Critically, in this context, sovereignty is repurposed from command over others to command over the self. It thus becomes a form of sovereignty in the world that is only available through Jain religious practice.

The concept of self-sovereignty describes forms of authority and rule that are divorced from the mundane practices of kingship, but it also names a shift from a devotion that attaches to the sovereign to one that attaches to the self-sovereign. In this sense, bhakti, most commonly translated as “devotion,” is both a political and religious logic that binds subjects to their ruler and devotees to the divine. This double valence of bhakti has been largely ignored in contemporary scholarship, which has come to view devotionalism as one of the most singularly important interpretative frameworks in the study of South Asian religions, and Hinduism in particular. And yet, as Karen Pechilis Prentis argues, bhakti, in a similar sense to the concept sovereignty, does not have a singular definition. Therefore, any discussion of the intersecting discourses of bhakti and sovereignty requires an historical and geographically specific precision to unpack their meanings as well as their overlap. The connection between devotionalism and sovereignty is often alluded to, but remains largely under-developed within this body of bhakti scholarship. For example, Archana Verma says, “The poetic idiom of Tamil Bhakti thus explicated the symbolism of divine sovereignty in a subtle manner. The major factors of sectarian conflict, the growth of the pilgrimage network, and the evolution of ritualization and devotionalism and dichotomic discourse carried within

themselves the undercurrent of this symbolic parallel between divine and human sovereignty.”  

Such statements gesture to the fact that the divine objects of devotional traditions often capitalize on the symbolism of sovereign kingship while at the same time articulating novel forms of sovereignty that derive from religious practice. All this to say, this activation of the concept and practices related to royal sovereignty—here as a triangulation between asceticism, devotionalism, and kingship—is in no way unique to Digambara Jainism. But in Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava religious contexts, the god is imagined as a literal king; temple practice, therefore, reflects the practices of a court (of course, in medieval India the inverse was also true, the king was equally imagined as divine).  

The Jain case is notably different; the adoption of royal metaphors and practices paradoxically serves to reimagine proper kingship itself. The final two chapters of this dissertation highlight a specific historical moment when Jain's fashioned devotional practices that shifted the center of gravity of the concept of sovereignty--from a mundane royal sovereign to an ascetic self-sovereign.

To begin to understand what these Jains were up to I propose to frame their theoretical formulations of sovereignty as “political theology.” Carl Schmitt has notably
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80 This shared culture and interrelatedness between the court and the temple can be endlessly articulated. For example, a Cāḷukya inscription at the Māraṭēśvara temple in Kallūr, Raichur District dated to 1134 C.E., describes the grant of certain taxes for the maintenance of the haḍapa, or the betel bag bearer, of the God Māraṭēśvara. Channabasappa S. Patil and Vinoda C. Patil, eds. *IK*, Vol. 4, no. 309. What is so striking about this inscription is the haḍapa was an important figure almost exclusively associated with medieval kings and courts and yet here we have the haḍapa of a god located within a temple. This inscription suggests that the sumptuary and ritualistic elements of medieval courtly culture were replicated or co-produced in tandem with temple culture. I am indebted to Daud Ali for a wonderful summer of research during which time this fascinating inscription came up.
proposed the concept of political theology, which he uses to describe the political appropriation of theological concepts.\(^81\) He argues, for instance, ‘‘Imitate the immutable decrees of the divinity.’’ This was the ideal of the legal life of the state that was immediately evident to the rationalism of the eighteenth century. This utterance is found in Rousseau’s essay Political Economy. The politicization of theological concepts, especially with respect to the concept of sovereignty, is so striking that it has not escaped any true expert on his writings.”\(^82\) From Descartes and Rousseau to Tocqueville, Schmitt captures how theological concepts and thinking animated the political sphere and, especially, notions of sovereignty in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe and America. However, the term political theology—in which political is used as an adjectival modifier of theology—does not accurately capture the phenomena that Schmitt names, wherein the theological modifies the political. More accurately, Schmitt is getting at something like a theological polity. I use the term political theology to describe the theological absorption of political concepts: the theological is modified by the political here. However, such movement from one domain to the other did not occur only at the discursive level, but also through a shared materiality. For example, Ernst Kantorowicz observes,

Infinite cross-relations between Church and State, active in every century of the Middle Ages, produced hybrids in either camp. Mutual borrowings and exchanges of insignia, political symbols, prerogatives, and rights of honor had been carried on perpetually between the spiritual and secular leaders of Christian society. The pope adorned his tiara with a golden crown, donned the imperial purple, and was preceded by the imperial banners when riding in solemn procession through the streets of Rome. The emperor wore under his crown a mitre, donned the pontifical shoes and other clerical raiments, and received, like the bishop, the ring at his coronation. These

\(^81\) Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005), 36.
\(^82\) Ibid., 46.
borrowings affected, in the earlier Middle Ages, chiefly the ruling individuals, both spiritual and secular, until finally the sacerdotium had an imperial appearance and the regnum a clerical touch.\(^{83}\)

The picture that Kantorowicz draws of the Europeans Middle Ages was equally true of premodern South Asia. The political and theological constantly transacted. This dissertation explores particular mutations of this transaction in the medieval Deccan, between Jains and feudal courts.

6. Chapter Outline

Following Schmitt and Kantorowicz, my dissertation intervenes in the study of religion through a focus on the interaction of religious and political spheres in the premodern world. How were these complementary spheres symbiotically, but also paradoxically, related? How did the religious inform the political, and, perhaps more problematically, how did the political inform the religious? My interest in these questions has led me to explore how religious communities harnessed this tension in order to develop a symbolic and ideological hierarchy in which ideal political worlds were only realizable through the avenue of religion.

My first chapter, "Archive of Aspirations: Jain Literati and the Making of a Cosmopolitan Court," examines the Sanskrit literary culture of the ninth-century Rāṣṭrakūṭa court of King Amoghavarṣa (814-878 C.E.), excavating an emergent but ephemeral Jain discourse addressed to and about kings that culminates in the first extant Ādipurāṇa of Jinasēna. From Ugrāditya's Kalyāṇakāraka (A Beneficial Practice) to Mahāvīrācarya's Gaṇitasārasaṃgraha (A Compendium on the Essence of Mathematics), I read the Jain Sanskrit texts of this court as complex textualizations of Jain courtly

aspirations, participation in, and construction of the intellectual and literary imaginary of
the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire. I unpack these Jains’ preoccupation with King Amōghavarṣa—
following him as he moves through literary and epigraphical materials—to suggest that
Jains soon turned away from Sanskrit and to Kannada following the lead of the
Kavirājamārgaṇ, in which he appears as an authorizing voice. Collectively, I see these
texts and their linguistic registers as evidence of a broader Jain turn to literature as a site
to look beyond the horizons of the Jain community and to address themselves to the king,
the court, and the larger cosmopolitan world of the medieval period.

Jinasēṇa’s Ādipurāṇa inspired poets throughout the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire including
the Eastern Cāḷukya poet Pampa’s Ādipurāṇa and Western Gaṅga military general
Cāvunḍarāya’s Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurusapurāṇa. Chapter two, “Connective Tissue: Literati,
Texts, Polities” challenges traditional understandings of empire based on territorial reach
to argue that the relationships that imperial centers maintained with their feudatories were
the key to political stability. While Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amoghavarṣa was something of a
failed military commander, I argue that he assembled an empire through a shared literary
aesthetic, generic commitments, and language choice. In tracking these Sanskrit and
Kannada poets and their texts, we see them inhabit a wide variety of social and
institutional roles, extending from the temple to the court, and illuminating the finer
details of the status of Jain monasticism in the region to the lived materiality of medieval
literary patronage. In paying attention to the lives’ of these poets we palpably see the
interpenetration of religious and political domains and the role of literary composition as
a tool of power. This alternative literary empire reveals the ways in which Jain monks,
poets, and military generals were the connective tissue that bound polities of this moment
together.

Through close readings of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa, written in the style of a Sanskrit mahākāvya or epic court poem, my third chapter begins to build the argument that it was through this genre that Jain authors most directly addressed themselves to kings and to political power by theorizing and modeling with it meant to be an ideal king. In "The Kingdom is a Poisonous Flower: Kingship as a Path to Renunciation," I argue that while Jinasēna quite self-consciously posits renunciation as the natural outcome of kingship rightly lived, he also sees the spheres of kingship and the sphere of liberation as intimately bound together into a larger continuum of mundane and spiritual sovereignty. Narratologically and poetically, kingship represents an intensified relationship with the world, a saturated lens through which to view human experience. It is the experience of sumptuary and aesthetic excess and the realization that kingship is itself ephemeral that precipitates liberation. Kingship is a state that is both a mark of moral development and a necessary sensorium that pushes the soul towards liberation. Enacting his generic claims, Jinasēna attempts to transform mahākāvya into an avenue for Jain religious narrative and, at the same time, to make Jain narrative an appropriate topic for court poetry. On another, less apparent level, by rendering the religious narrative of the Ādipurāṇa in the style of a courtly mahākāvya, Jinasēna effected a formal union of courtly and religious domains that commingled worldly and other worldly concerns in both the form and content. I argue that Jinasēna sought to transform the idiom of the court—to make mahākāvya a vehicle for Jain narrative material and vice versa—in the same way he sought changes to the court itself. Put plainly, to intervene into the aestheticized representation of the court, to turn it on its head, was to intervene in the reproduction of the court itself. Bound
together in Jinasēna's poetry, the Ādipurāṇa as mahākāvya became a site through which to produce, project, and reflect novel religious and political arrangements. The resulting poem is one that sees religion and politics, kingship and renunciation, and pleasure and dispassion as deeply interconnected.

My fourth chapter, "Transmigratory Love Stories in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇa: Caught in a Bad Romance?" considers how the Kannada poet Pampa translated and transformed Jinasēna's Sanskrit mahākāvya into a Kannada campū (mixed prose and verse) in 941 C.E. I begin with the ways that Pampa disburdens the Ādipurāṇa of any extra-poetic material transforming the text into the pinnacle of Jain courtly literary production. Indeed, Pampa is far less concerned with religious instruction than Jinasēna and far more invested in exploring the emotional and aesthetic registers available in the Ādipurāṇa that are incipient in Jinasēna’s earlier Sanskrit version. Pampa focuses, in particular, on the affect of love. As Daud Ali and others have shown, kings are persistently represented as romantically entangled figures within premodern South Asian literary and epigraphic culture. For Pampa, the figure of the king then becomes a central optic through which to understand the place of human intimacy, sexuality, and affective attachment within the austere and ascetic emphasis of Jainism.

By the late tenth century, Jains began to look beyond the hermetic horizons of the court and transformed their aesthetic register to align with a far more expansive audience. This new aesthetic entailed changes within the literary object itself, even as it impelled Jains to adopt novel, non-literary forms of artistic expression. My fifth chapter, "Acts of Translation: The Ādipurāṇa in Text, Image, and Inscription," argues that this moment of transition is neatly captured in the figure of the Western Gaṅga general Cāvuṇḍarāya.
978 C.E., Cāvuṇḍarāya composed the *Trīsaṣṭiśalākāpurusapurāṇam*, the first extant Kannada prose text in which the most substantial section is the *Ādipurāṇa*. In 981 C.E., Cāvuṇḍarāya commissioned a Bāhubali monolith to be built at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. In viewing this monolith, I argue, we inhabit the gaze of King Bharata, and see—as Cāvuṇḍarāya asserts—that to become an ideal king is to become a Jain devotee. Cāvuṇḍarāya's Bāhubali monolith amounts to a material interpretation of a literary text: it quite literally accords a density and heightened grandeur to a single moment of his narrative. Succeeding writers like Boppaṇa, Pañcabāṇa, and Candrama Kavi took the hint by producing texts and inscriptions about Bāhubali as indebted to this monolith as they were to the earlier literary sources.

In tracking the various Jain improvisations with the *Ādipurāṇa*—across language, genre, style, and artistic medium—my dissertation demonstrates a broader Jain investment in the imaginative capacity of narrative to mediate between worldly and spiritual concerns. In so doing, I argue that Jains consistently sought to conceptually figure the worldly and spiritual, the political and religious, and even the sexual and the ascetic, as deeply imbricated social worlds rather than binaristic categories of human activity. By aestheticizing sovereignty, Jain poets created an imaginative space in which intense relations to the world could be made functional for Jain religious practice. What we are left with is a novel vision of Jainism: one that encourages subjects to let go of their loves only after holding onto them for a lifetime or three, one that demands renunciation of the world but only after you have conquered the eight directions as a cakravartin or sovereign emperor. I conclude, however, by considering the persistence of this Jain investment in sovereignty outside the space of the court through the cultivation
of the *maṭha* or monastery and figure of the bhaṭṭāraka, the head of the *maṭha*.
CHAPTER 1

An Archive of Aspirations: Jain Literati and the Making of a Cosmopolitan Court

1. Introduction

The Digambara Jain Ādipurāṇas produced in the ninth- and tenth-century Deccan are composed in highly sophisticated courtly poetic genres in both Sanskrit and Kannada. The generic, linguistic, and literary styles that define these texts would have been unthinkable without the literary developments that occurred in the court of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarṣa (814-878 C.E.), the very same court in which the poet Jinasēna wrote the first Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa.¹ This court is notable for facilitating two dramatic linguistic shifts: the Jain adoption of Sanskrit and the emergence of Kannada as a literary language. Notably, both of these newly available registers (or, at least, new to the poets who adopted them) self-consciously address themselves in varying degrees to King Amōghavarṣa. The body of Sanskrit poetry from this court is entirely Jain and understands Amōghavarṣa to be a Jain king. Contrarily, the single Kannada text produced in the same court, Śrīvijaya’s Kavirājamārgaṃ, describes Amōghavarṣa through Vaiṣṇava titles (birudas), which are also found in contemporary inscriptions from his reign. The work of this chapter is to understand the following questions: Who did these poets imagine themselves addressing in the figure of this specific king? What is the image of an ideal Jain king that they reveal? Why did these poets address him in the

¹ The name Amōghavarṣa is one of this king’s many titles including Nrpatuṅga, Nītinirantaraka, Pṛthvivallabha and so on. Citing verse 1.25 of Buhler’s edition of the Rathor grants, Bhandarkar speculates that Amōghavarṣa’s proper name was likely Sarva. R.G. Bhandarkar, Early History of the Dekkan Down to the Mahomedan Conquest (Bombay: Government Central Press, 1895), 67. Similarly, Bhat records his name as Šarva. D.R. Bhat, “No. 15—Javakheda Plates of Amoghavarsa I, Saka 742” EI, Vol. 32, 130, v. 22. I use the title Amōghavarṣa throughout the dissertation because this is the name by which the poet Jinasēna most commonly refers to him.
languages and discursive mediums that they did? How do we make sense of Amōghavarṣa’s disparate representations in literature and epigraphy as well as in Sanskrit and Kannada? How do these poetic investments in the figure of Amōghavarṣa, as well as the literary developments of his court, prepare us to read the Ādipurāṇas produced in the ninth and tenth centuries? After embracing Sanskrit in the ninth century, why did Jains turn to Kannada in the tenth century as their language of literature? The answers to these questions lie in the nexus of religious communities, in the cultivation of literary languages, and in the imagination of political power. The near simultaneous emergence of Jain poets using Sanskrit and the Kannada language, and their mutual proximity to kingship, would have profound effects on the linguistic and literary developments in the region and on the trajectory that the Ādipurāṇa tradition would take.

Much has been made of the relationship between Jainism and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire. For example, the historian A.S. Altekar describes the state of Jainism in the ninth-century Deccan under the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as

…..probably the most flourishing period in the history of Jainism in the Deccan. Soon after it Jainism received a set-back owing to the rapid spread of the new Lingayat sect. In our period, however, the sect had no serious militant rival and was basking in the sunshine of popular and royal favor. The literary activity of the Jains was also remarkable in this age, and they seem to have taken an active part in the education of the masses.²

In this quote Altekar neatly captures the widespread perspective that this period represents the zenith of Jain influence in the region and a moment in which the tradition even held a certain kind of mass appeal. Other early Indian historians specifically identify Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarṣa as "a follower of the 'Digambara' branch of Jainism" and

"a pupil of Jinasēna."³ The association of Jainism with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas—epitomized by the close relationship between King Amōghavarṣa and the Jain monk Jinasēna—was further consolidated and intensified in its reception into contemporary western literary scholarship and the study of religion. Scholars transformed Amōghavarṣa into "an apostate from his traditional Vaiṣṇava faith" and consistently describe him as a "patron" of the poet Jinasēna.⁴ In turn, Jinasēna is elevated to Amōghavarṣa's "spiritual preceptor," "guru," and as "responsible for his conversion."⁵ The specifics of these assertions cannot be substantiated; apostate, patron, and preceptor simply do not appear in the primary sources. Indeed, it seems that the evidentiary basis of these historical claims is the unique concentration of Jain Sanskrit literature affiliated with King Amōghavarṣa's court. The Jain authors Jinasēna, Mahāvīrācarya, Śākaṭāyana, Ugrāditya, and the slightly later Guṇabhadra self-consciously address and invoke Amōghavarṣa through a variety of literary strategies and in genres ranging from grammar and poetry to mathematics. Read together, I argue that these authors and their texts imagine Amōghavarṣa as a king who embodies Jain ideals. The transformation of Amōghavarṣa into an ideal Jain king culminates with his authorial attribution of a widely circulating religious catechism called

³ Visvesvaranatha Reu, History of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (Rāṭhōḍas): From the Beginning to the Migration of Rao Siha Towards Marwar (Jodhpur: Archaeological Department, 1933), 7.
the Praśnottaratnamālike that, in at least few Digambara Jain recensions of the
manuscript, depicts him as renouncing his throne.

On the basis of this body of material, we might fairly assume, as Altekar and
others have done, that the Jain literature of Amōghavarṣa's court emerged out of and
therefore documents his religious beliefs. But this assumption itself relies on a circular set
of assumptions: that the literature of this period is the product of patronage; that literature
produced from patronage is reflective of the ideological commitments of its patron; and
that patronage itself was a sign of religious ecumenicalism, practice, or conversion. We
can see this conceptual collapse between literary production, patronage, and religious
identity underlying the assumptions about Amōghavarṣa and his relationship to Jainism:
that ninth-century Jain literary production is the product of Amōghavarṣa's royal largesse;
that Jain depictions of Amōghavarṣa as a Jain king are reflections of reality; and that
Amōghavarṣa converted to Jainism. These assumptions generated from this literary
archive deeply inform the reading of Amōghavarṣa's inscriptions, inscriptions that
persistently employ standard Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vaiṣṇava praśastis and demonstrate no direct
material patronage to the Jain community, but are nevertheless read through the lens of
an already assumed Jain religious orientation.6 That is, the presence of a robust Jain
literary culture is used to explain away the evidentiary void of material patronage.

What would it mean to read the Jain literary production of Amōghavarṣa's court
outside this mechanistic understanding that elides complexity in favor of an ideal-typical
model? What if we read Amōghavarṣa as Jain, not necessarily because he was or was not,

---

6 The privileged evidentiary status of this Jain literary archive over the inscriptional
archive is itself a striking historiographical inversion in a region whose abundant
epigraphical records typically predominates in its histories.
but because his appearance as such is an archival effect—a composite image yielded by the fragmentary records extant in the archive? Beyond Amôghavarṣa, what else do these Jain texts tell us? What other types of evidentiary value do they possess? To answer these questions entails a broader rethinking of the varied textualities (epigraphical and literary) comprising the record of Amôghavarṣa's reign. Too frequently scholars treat these apparently referential moments as being of the order of what Dominick LaCapra called "the documentary," which he defines as aspects of a text that convey knowledge about or situate it in empirical reality.\(^7\) Scholarship on this period indeed betrays an overriding emphasis on the documentary aspects of literary texts (to say nothing of epigraphy), transforming them into objects to be mined for facts. This scholarly tendency divorces the text from "its own historicity and its relations to socio-political processes (for example, relations of power...)," effectively transforming utterances produced out of situated constellations of power into neutral bearers of historiographical data.\(^8\) What this approach misses, in other words, are those features of the text that LaCapra calls the "work-like," that is, those features that do not simply reflect reality, but attempt to intervene into reality, to remake it, reshape it, and refashion it.\(^9\) My argument here is that the features of these Jain texts that appear documentary also possess work-like qualities that enable them to not simply reflect historical reality, but to shape our perceptions of it. We see Amôghavarṣa's court as these Jain authors wanted it to be seen.

The interests of this chapter lie in reading for the work-like qualities of these Jain texts produced in Amôghavarṣa's court. With care and attention to their specific genres,

\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^9\) Ibid.
forms, and literary strategies, I read these texts as possessing a different sort of evidentiary value; I read them as complex textualizations of Jain courtly aspirations and participation. I argue that these Jain materials focused on Amōghavarṣa are evidence of a persistent Jain investment in kingship as a site of authority and, more broadly, that they represent the condensation of the elite audience of the court into the single figure of the king. I read the literature of Amōghavarṣa's court not simply as documentary evidence of his religious affiliation or his status as literary patron—contingencies that seem to me to be irresolvable barring the availability of new and illuminating materials—but as strategic literary representations that align Jainism with classical notions of kingship and, as we see in the next chapter on Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa, inject the rhetoric of kingship into Jain philosophy and practice. These texts are also evidence of a broader Jain attempt to use kāvyā, the very idiom of the court, to look beyond the horizons of the Jain community and to address themselves to the larger cosmopolitan world of the medieval period.

I begin with an all too brief history of the relationship between Digambara Jainism and Sanskrit, a history that understands the Jain Sanskrit writing affiliated with Amōghavarṣa’s court not as a sudden shift, but as a further development in their complex and multivalent language usage. I argue that what makes these materials distinct is their concentration within a single court and their self-conscious attempts to address and imagine Amōghavarṣa as a Jain king. Indeed, Amōghavarṣa serves as a point of condensation for Jain aspirations and desires at a moment in which they began to look outside of their own community to a wider world accessible through the king, the court, and the Sanskrit Cosmopolis. The next section explores Jinasēna’s Pārśvabhuyudaya and its vision of cosmopolitan belonging that was imaginatively enacted through Sanskrit
kāvya. This Jain rendering of Kālidāsa’s Mēghadūta literally and figuratively binds Jainism to one of the preeminent texts of the Sanskrit tradition and, in so doing, provocatively suggests that Jains can do Sanskrit better. After exploring the Jain Sanskrit literature associated with Amōghavarṣa’s court, I read this literary corpus alongside contemporary Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions. I suggest that the dissonance between these archives further substantiates the practice of reading the Jain literature of this court as aspirational or work-like rather than documentary. These putatively Vaiṣṇava Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions also reveal that the successful Jain penetration of courtly literary culture did not extend to the sphere of imperial epigraphy: there, the language of Vaiṣṇavism reigned supreme. As a counterpoint, I explore how Jainism was elevated within the inscriptional record of the smaller dynasties of the western Deccan, effectively becoming the inscriptional language of power at a regional rather than imperial level. The Vaiṣṇava tenor of Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions carries through into the first extant Kannada text, Śrīvijaya’s Kavirājamārgaṃ, also composed in Amōghavarṣa’s court. This text not only imagined Kannada as a literary language—that was taken up by later Kannada writers including Pampa in his Ādipurāṇam—but also provided a powerful counter perspective on Amōghavarṣa’s court that complexified the vision offered up by the Jain texts. My discussion of the Kavirājamārgaṃ touches upon early debates in Kannada literature about the status of Amōghavarṣa as both a Jain and as the reputed author of the Kavirājamārgaṃ, as well as Śrīvijaya’s later interpolation as a Jain. In reviewing these debates, I suggest that perhaps we are asking the wrong questions of our materials—about authorship and religious affiliation—and instead suggest that we read the divergent set of religious signifiers present in the Kavirājamārgaṃ as indicating the complexity of
religious belonging in the medieval period. The complexity of the medieval religious landscape comes into sharp relief in the final section on the *Praśnōttararatnamālike*. Premodern religious communities throughout the subcontinent including the Tamil Śaivas, Tibetan Buddhists, and West Indian Śvētāmbara Jains claimed this religious catechism as their own by ascribing authorship to a figure within their tradition. The Deccani Digambara Jain also interacted with this text in the same way by ascribing its authorship to Amōghavarṣa and by using it as a site to record his royal renunciation. I argue that the text’s representation of Amōghavarṣa is the culmination of a set of Jain literary strategies that sought to transform him into an ideal Jain king—that is, a renunciate king. I further consider how the renunciate king Amōghavarṣa was mobilized, reproduced, translated, and made common sense by medieval Deccani Digambara Jains. The connection between kingship and renunciation proposed by the figure of Amōghavarṣa within the *Praśnōttararatnamālike* presages the conceptual collapse that the Ādipurāṇa tradition would further enact. I conclude by considering what these materials of Amōghavarṣa’s court have to tell us about the forms and investments of the ninth- and tenth-century Sanskrit and Kannada Ādipurāṇas.

2. Developments in Digambara Jain Sanskrit: Imagining an Ideal Jain King

Indian and western scholarship privileges the ninth-century Rāṣṭrakūṭa court as a literary highpoint when "Jains turn decisively to Sanskrit."¹⁰ As noted, the prominence of Jainism in this equation is due to the prevalence of Jain intellectuals and poets in the court of Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amōghavarṣa. The characterization of this court as the scene of a linguistic turning point—when Jains turned to Sanskrit—condenses historical processes

---

around Jain language usage into a singular moment; in so doing, it forecloses consideration of a deeper literary past. This foreclosed past includes a history of Jains using Sanskrit as their technical language of commentary, theory, and, to a lesser extent, literature—in modes such as kathā (story)—that do not fit neatly within received narratives of Sanskrit literary history. However, to focus on the issue of language choice alone is to miss the larger intellectual and religious dynamics that animated courtly life in this period. As we will see, what differentiates the ninth century is not just the mere fact of Jains writing in Sanskrit. Rather, the Sanskrit texts produced by Jain literati in Amōghavarṣa’s court are remarkable in their participation in a larger project that sought to address and to imagine the king through a Sanskrit poetic idiom and, in so doing, to create a court that was simultaneously cosmopolitan and Jain. By emplotting the literary production of Amōghavarṣa’s court within a deeper history, we can begin to see how this period marks a further development rather than a dramatic shift in how Digambara Jains in the ninth-century Deccan were using Sanskrit and the larger project for which they put Sanskrit to use.

Any discussion of Jainism and language necessarily starts with their oft-highlighted rejection of Sanskrit that attended their refusal of Brahmanical practice and thought. Within this received history, Jainism evolved as a distinct religion based on an ideological break that bound Vedic Brahmanism to Sanskrit and, analogously, Jainism to Prakrit.  

11 Here, we see language as a defining aspect of religious community and a site through which community boundaries were drawn. Continuing this narrative, it was only

---

at the beginning of the Common Era when Sanskrit became dislodged from the Brahmanical liturgical sphere to become the language of literature and the court that Jain authors tentatively began to utilize Sanskrit for philosophical discourse.\textsuperscript{12} It was not until the medieval period, after the classical period of Sanskrit, that Jains are understood to have fully embraced Sanskrit literary culture—or so the story goes. While this received history perhaps holds true for the Śvētāmbara community, premodern Digambara Jain intellectuals and poets, such as those that populated the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court, belie this narrative. They show far more linguistic freedom—using Sanskrit, a variety of Prakrits, a mixture of the two, and, before too long Kannada—thereby complicating the extent to which language can serve as a reliable marker of a religious community.

The liberal position held by Digambaras on language is historiographically obscured by the overriding emphasis on the Śvētāmbara tradition. As Padmanabh Jaini has noted, particular historical trajectories have meant that Euro-American Jain scholarship basically amounted to Śvētāmbara scholarship.\textsuperscript{13} While recent scholars of Jainism have sought to rectify this imbalance, within the wider study of South Asia the Śvētāmbara sect still too often stands in for the entirety of the Jain tradition.\textsuperscript{14} The

\textsuperscript{12} For a detailed account of the emergence of Sanskrit as a literary language see Pollock, Language of the Gods, 39-74.
\textsuperscript{14} Starting with the early work of P.S. Jaini, Jain Studies has sought to rectify this imbalance in the Śvētāmbara focus of the field. For example, see P.S. Jaini, The Jaina Path of Purification (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979) and Collected Papers on Jaina Studies (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2000). Among more recent scholarship, the work of Michael Carrithers has been particularly important in bringing a new focus to Digambara Jainism in South India, including: Michael Carrithers, “Concretely Imagining the Southern Digambara Jain Community, 1899-1920,” Modern Asian Studies 30 (1996): 523-548; “The Foundations of Community Among Southern Digambar Jains,” in The Assembly of Listeners: Jains in Society, ed. Michael Carrithers
construction of a more textured account of the Jain literati of Amōghavarṣa’s court must begin by taking seriously the nuances of religious sectarian affiliation and its geographical specificity. The literati of this court were, with few exceptions, Digambara Jains. Solidified at the fifth-century Council of Vallabi, the major two divisions within the Jain community, the Digambaras and Śvētāmbaras, maintain very different positions vis-à-vis language practice. The origins of this divide go back to the Śvētāmbara canonical works that describe the Tīrthaṅkara as preaching in a variant of Prakrit called Ardhamāghadhā or in a language that recipients received in their own dialect. The


15 Within the group of Jain literati affiliated with Amōghavarṣa’s court, the grammarians Śākaṭāyana was a member of the Yāpanīya sect, a Jain sect that was specific to South India. Very little is known about this sect other than they appear to have practiced a hybrid form of Jainism that adhered to Digambara stipulations around nudity while, at the same time, following the more liberal views of the Śvētāmbaras, including their belief in the liberation of women. However, from texts like Dēvasēna’s Darśanasāra and the anonymous Gaṇabhēda, there is some indication that the Yāpanīyas were considered a saṅgha within a larger network of Digambara saṅghas. At the same time, these Digambara texts also conceive of this group as a Śvētāmbara schism. A.N. Upadhye, “More Light on the Yāpanīya Sangha: A Jaina Sect,” Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 55 ¼ (1974): 10-11. Upadhye suggests that the Yāpanīyas and the Digambaras coexisted with intermittent conflict in the medieval Kannada speaking region and, that today, many Yāpanīya images have found their way into Digambara temples. Ibid., 21.

Digambara post-canonical works depict him as emitting a divine sound (*divyadhvani*).\(^{17}\)

Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa* describes the scene of Ādinātha preaching in the assembly hall (*samavasaraṇa*) as follows:

Imitating the thundering of a cloud,

a great divine sound emerged from his lotus like face.

Just like the sun, it shone

destroying the darkness of delusion

concealed in the minds of great people.

Even though only a single sound,

it encompassed all human languages

and many animal languages too.

Through the greatness of the Jina,

it awakened truth by removing ignorance.\(^{18}\)

By placing a sound instead of a language in the mouth of the Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha,

Digambara authors like Jinasēna entirely sidestep the issue of sacred language. Despite rejecting Śvētāmbara canonical claims about the sacred status of Ardhamāgadhī, and in fact flatly rejecting the entirety of the Śvētāmbara canon as apocryphal, Digambaras continued to use Prakrit.\(^{19}\) They believed that the original Jain scriptures, although lost

\(^{17}\) There has been much debate over what constitutes *divyadhvani*. Paul Dundas notes, "There is agreement that a 'divine sound' (*divyadhvani*) flows from the body of the tīrthaṅkara when he is preaching, but a whole range of disparate views came into play in the course of Digambara history as to whether this emerges from his mouth or is constituted by syllables or not. The *divyadhvani* is also sometimes described as containing within itself all tongues, most specifically the 18 major and 170 minor languages of India. One source, the Mahāpurāṇa, states that it is naturally one language, while another, the Darśanaprābhṛta, claims that it half consists of Ardhamāgadhī and half of all other languages. A medieval commentator on the Darśanaprābhṛta goes so far as to claim that the gods receive the *divyadhvani* in the form of Sanskrit..." Dundas, “Jain Attitudes Towards the Sanskrit Language,” 141.

\(^{18}\) divyamahādhvanir asya mukhābjān megharavānukṛtir niragacchat ।

bhavyamahānagato mahatamahognn adyutad esa yathaiva tamoriḥ ॥ 23.69

ekatayo api cha sarvanābhaśāh so 'ntaraneṣṭa bahuś ca kubhāśāḥ ।

apraptipattim apāsyā ca tatvāṁ bodhayati sma jinasya mahimnā ॥ JĀP, 23.70

\(^{19}\) An unexplained inconsistency within the Śvetāmbara tradition is that the importance of Ardhamāgadhī as a sacred language even though the Śvetāmbara scriptures are largely
and corrupted beyond measure, were written in Ardhamāghadhī and employed Jaina Śauraseni—inflected with both Ardhamāghadhī and Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrits—in the composition of their post-canonical works, the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama and the Kasāyaprābhṛta. That is to say, unbound from a single scriptural language, Digambara Jains were free to cultivate a repertoire of linguistic possibilities that included Prakrit among others. The Jayadhavaḷā, a commentary on the Kasāyaprābhṛta, composed by Virasēna and his then discipline Jinasēna, demonstrates the linguistic flexibility available to Digambara writers of this period. In the colophon verses of the Jayadhavaḷā, Jinasēna describes the language of their commentary as a mix (miśra) of Sanskrit and Prakrit that he calls a mixture of "gems and coral" (maṇipravāla). Thus, the initial moment of divine speechified sound resonating throughout the assembly hall opens up the Digambara tradition to freely move between languages and their associated literary registers and genres.

Starting as early as the fifth-century sectarian split, south Indian Digambara Jain


20 Dundas, “Jain Attitudes Towards the Sanskrit Language.” 145; Jain, Hiralal, ed. The Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali with the Commentary Dhavalā of Virasena (Amravati: Shrimant Seth Laxmichandra Shitabrai, 1939), iv.

21 prāyāḥ prākṛtabhārtyā kvacit saṃskṛtamiśrayāḥ prakṣṛtāyāṃ prakṣṛtāyāṃ 
maniprapālanyāyena prokto ’yam granthavistaraḥ || JD, v. 37 via Pushpa Gupta, Rasa in the Jaina Sanskrit Mahākāvyas (Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1993) quoting from Paramananda Sastrī, Jaina Dharma kā Prācīna Itihāsa, Vol. 2, 181. What Jinasēna describes as "maniprapāla" is a style that intersperses Sanskrit verses within Prakrit prose and gāthas. This, of course, is quite different than the popular Maniprapallā style of mixed Sanskrit and Tamil first defined in the eleventh-century Vīracōḻiyam, a Tamil rendition of Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa. Anne Monius, Imagining a Place for Buddhism: Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 119. I had a great deal of difficulty getting ahold of the Jayadhavaḷā praśasti. When the text was originally published, the colophon was left out. I was able to reconstruct thirty verses through secondary sources.
intellectuals were quick to embrace Sanskrit as a technical or scientific language. Perhaps the richest example of early Jain uses of Sanskrit center around Umasvati’s *Tattvārtha Sūtra*. Dated anywhere from the second to the fourth century, this text is the earliest extant example of Jain experimentation with Sanskrit aphoristic *sūtra* style.\(^{22}\) Laying at the temporal boundaries of Jain sectarianism, the *Tattvārtha Sūtra* is accepted by both Jain sectarian communities. Within the early medieval western Deccan alone, the *Tattvārtha Sūtra* spawned numerous Digambara Sanskrit commentaries: Pūjyapāda’s sixth-century *Sārvārthasiddhi*, Akalaṅka’s eighth-century *Rājavātika*, and Vidyānanda’s ninth-century *Ślōkavārttika*. In addition, there are the no longer extant Kannada commentaries by Tumbalurācārya and Šyamakundācārya.\(^{23}\) To do justice to the intellectual richness of the pre-ninth-century Digambara tradition is impossible with just this one example. However, the *Tattvārtha Sūtra* and its commentaries demonstrate the type of vitality that Digambara Jains brought to a diverse range of fields including grammar, medicine, philosophy, poetics, and religious commentary. Digambara Jain literature from this region that predates the ninth century is simply nowhere as dense as the scientific and commentarial output. The lack of historical density leaves us with only traces of a literary history that appears much richer. The extant Jain Sanskrit literary texts from the western Deccan include, for example, Raviśēna’s *Padmapurāṇa* (678 C.E.), Jaṭāsimhanandi’s *Varāṅgacarita* (c. 7th C.E.), and Dhanañjaya’s *Dvisandhānakāvya* (c. 800 C.E.).\(^{24}\) However, these earlier Digambara Sanskrit texts are often difficult to date or


\(^{24}\) Bronner notes that Dhanañjaya ends each chapter of the *Dvisandhānakāvya* with a pun playing upon his own name. Yigal Bronner, *Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement*
assign to a specific court. This earlier nascent Digambara Jain investment in Sanskrit as a language of both scientific discourse and of poetry and literature comes together and intensifies in the ninth-century court of Amoghavarṣa.

Jinasēna and the Jain literati of the ninth-century court of King Amoghavarṣa represent a unique moment when the literary and epigraphical archive thickens and Jain activity within a single specific court comes to life. Along with Jinasēna, there were a number of Jain intellectuals writing during Amoghavarṣa's reign. I refer to them collectively here as "Jain literati." While they fall short of the label "literary class" with the political connotations that it carries, they are united in their participation in the larger Jain project of the court and a textual awareness of the broader Jain intellectual and literary production of the period. These Jain literati wrote in various genres—including grammars, literary texts, mathematical treatises, tracts on medicine, and scriptural commentary—that were clearly produced in conversation: Virasēna's Dhavaḷā commentary on the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama includes logarithms that became more fully developed in Mahāvīrācarya's mathematical treatise, the Gaṇitasārasamgraha, and Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa quotes from Śākaṭāyana's Sanskrit grammar. Through this diverse set of genres, these authors sought to address themselves to Amoghavarṣa; they titled texts after him, eulogized him in their praśastis (panegyrics), ascribed text to him, and recorded his Jain practice and renunciation. These Jain literati imagined Amoghavarṣa as
an ideal Jain king, a follower of syādvāda and ultimately a renunciate, a vision of kingship also theorized in Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa.

The various genres of Jain Sanskrit writing in Amōghavarṣa’s court—and, in particular, grammar and kāvya—are the very genres that premodern courts throughout South Asia produced in what Sheldon Pollock has called the "Sanskrit Cosmopolis."

From the fourth to thirteenth centuries, Sanskrit spread from Tamil Nadu to Java as a translocal language unbound from a particular empire or religious formation. Instead, for Pollock, what bound the cosmopolis together was the shared embrace of the expressive, "aesthetic power" of Sanskrit.25 It would be perhaps more accurate to say that the power writers accessed through the use of Sanskrit was nothing more than a capability to performatively participate in and reproduce an imagined community in which Sanskrit was meaningful. The production of an imagined sociality is not a technical aspect of the language, but the capacity it achieves through articulation with specific political and social orders. Unfortunately, scholarship on the Sanskrit cosmopolis has tended to discount the wide diversity of communities and practices that comprised this social imaginary. In so doing, it tends to obscure the ways in which the Sanskrit cosmopolis was imagined, enacted, maintained, and remade in and from discrete localities. 26 This avenue

25 Pollock further observes, "The literary function, however it may be described—as figuration, suggestion, aestheticized emotion, propriety—is not an inherent capacity of language as such but is something restricted to a few languages alone." Pollock, The Language of the Gods in the World of Men, 90. I find this argument quite troubling given the political claims on the basis of language. Interpreted at an extreme, such claims about language echo nineteenth-century German Idealist claims that German was endowed with a particular expressive capacity. While Pollock has provoked the ire of the Hindu right with his liberal politics, in this regard his scholarship seems vulnerable in to cooptation by more extremist groups if they actually bothered to read it.

26 Jesse Ross Knutson’s recent monograph importantly explores the regional articulation of Sanskrit in the thirteenth-century Śena Court, marking one of the first sustained efforts
of scholarship is interested in the undeniable “translocal” quality of Sanskrit rather than the forms of repetition and participation at the local that make the translocal possible. This approach, then, has no interest in and can provide no account for the role of Jain literati within courtly culture and, as a result, their activity lingers as a question or a mere footnote to premodern cosmopolitanism in South Asia. The case of Amōghavarṣa’s court demonstrates the necessity of not simply tracking the unfolding of the Sanskrit cosmopolis, but attending to the situated, local forces that led writers to discover a powerful tool in Sanskrit writing. For the Jain literati I study here, the success of their project, addressed to and modeled for the king, required the production and cultivation of a courtly literary and textual milieu as a route of cosmopolitan belonging. For these Jains, the figure of the king served as a point of condensation between cosmopolitan ideology and religious discourse, the strategic articulation of one with the other. Thus, Amōghavarṣa’s court was not so much a moment when Jains turned to Sanskrit at Pollock suggests, but rather a moment when Jain literati discovered in Sanskrit a tool of political expression and belonging.

Recent scholarship on medieval India has productively "de-emphasized the figure of the king as an embodiment of 'kingship,'” in favor of focusing on "the court itself as an arena of activity and knowledge.” Somewhat antithetically, the texts produced by these Jain literati within the wider arena of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court return us to the figure of the

---

king. My focus on this Jain investment in the king is not to re-inscribe the centrality of the king as a site of historical inquiry, but rather to consider the way the figure of the king endured as an object of address. Of course, this makes sense. The complex texture and hierarchy of the medieval court apparent in the work of Daud Ali and Sunil Kumar is difficult to capture and designate.\(^{28}\) Despite histories that highlight the diffuse flows of power that suffused the court, the king still—at least symbolically—functioned at the pinnacle of such hierarchies that were neatly collapsible into this singular figure. Thus, I read this Jain preoccupation with kingship as equally indexing an investment in the broader court epitomized by the king.

Even with the extant Jain corpus affiliated with Amōghavarṣa’s court, we learn very little about the historical personage of this king from the texts produced in his court. This, in and of itself, is unsurprising given that, as David Shulman notes, "the medieval South Indian king eludes us as a person."\(^{29}\) However, we learn a great deal about who the Jains understood and desired Amōghavarṣa to be: a Jain practitioner who renounces his throne. The processes through which Jain literati created Amōghavarṣa as a Jain king while simultaneously transforming his court into a Jain cosmopolitan literary space requires that we attend to the diversity of the forms of intellectual and literary engagement. Jain invocations of Amōghavarṣa—ranging from the merely incidental to elaborate praśastis—appear across the spectrum of Jain textual production. The very proliferation of generic forms of address reflects the diverse tactics through which Jains inscribed themselves within the court. It is precisely the disparate epistemological stakes

\(^{28}\) Ibid and Sunil Kumar, *The Emergence of the Delhi Sultanate, 1192-1286* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2007).

of these varied genres that obscures the investment common to all to them: the ideological function of Sanskrit as a form of royal address. As we will see, Jain literati seize upon this ideological function to routinely address Amōghavarṣa as a king who embodied Jain ideals.

This ideological work permeated texts, adhering even in the most incidental details. Drawing upon a rich tradition of Jain grammar that stretches back to the fifth-century Jainēndra Vyākaraṇa by Pūjyapāda, Śākaṭāyana’s Šabdānuśāsana illustrates the imperfect tense (laṅ) with two examples: "Deva besieged the Pāṇḍya" and "Amōghavarṣa burnt his enemies." Indicating past events that occur in the present, the tense employed in these examples necessarily places Śākaṭāyana within the reign of Amōghavarṣa and the political conflict with the Pāṇḍya dynasty. Similarly, Jinasēna describes the completion of the Jayadhavalā commentary as occurring within the virtuous reign of Amōghavarṣa, converting his reign into a mere fact of regnal dating. These passing references to Amōghavarṣa illustrate the quotidian exchange between Jain literati and the court. Here Amōghavarṣa is naturalized as part of a landscape as observed by Jain intellectuals. But Amōghavarṣa is not allowed to remain a part of the quotidian. The Jain literati of his court elevate him through their various modes of address. For example, Śākaṭāyana goes on to inscribe Amōghavarṣa’s name into the title of the auto-commentary to his grammar,

30 Shambhunath Tripathi, Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇam of Ācārya Śākāṭāyana: With the Svopajña Commentary, Amoghavṛtti (Delhi: Bharatiya Jnanapitha Publications, 1971), 11-12. Thank you to Andrew Ollet for drawing my attention to the importance of Śākaṭāyana's grammar.

the Amōghavṛtti (The Unerring Gloss). Virasena similarly eulogizes Amōghavarṣa in his Dhavalā commentary, a title that plays upon Amōghavarṣa's epithet Atiśayadhavaḷa, which means one who is exceedingly white. Within medieval South Asia whiteness was equated with both purity and fame giving the epithet a double meaning that applied to both Amōghavarṣa's moral and worldly qualities, a double meaning that extended to the Dhavalā commentary as well. Playing upon Amōghavarṣa’s titulature as well as the name of the earlier Dhavalā commentary, Virasena and Jinasena titled their joint commentary the Jayadhavaḷā (Victorious Fame/Victorious Purity). The practice of inscribing a patron's name within the title of a text, and frequently religious texts in particular, was one strategy through which Jain literati addressed their texts to the king.

Jain literati also addressed themselves to Amōghavarṣa through third person forms of address common in premodern epigraphical and literary praśastis. In the Pārśvābhyudya, Jinasena states: "Let the unfailing rain cloud, Lord Amōghavarṣa, forever protect the earth." The depth of this imagery is produced through Amōghavarṣa’s name, which translates to a fruitful or unfailing rain. The line then reads as an entreaty for rain and King Amōghavarṣa to protect the earth. This double entendre plays upon the specific association of the South India king as a bringer and ensurer of

---

33 It appears that the inclusion of the word "dhavaḷa" was common in Rāṣṭrakūṭa titulature. For example, Gōvinda II held the title "famous in the three worlds" (tribhuvanadhavaḷa). B.R. Bhandarkar, “No.26—Sanjan Plates of Amoghavarsha I: Saka-Samvat 793,” EI Vol. 18, 240.
34 For example, Nēmicandra's Gommaṭasāra incorporates "Gommaṭa" a popular epithet of the Gaṅga General Cāvuṇḍarāya into its title.
35 iti viracitam etatkāvyam āveṣṭya meghaṃ bahuṇgam apadoṣaṃ kālidāsasya kāvyam || PA, 4.70
rain in a material environment entirely dependent upon the monsoon as well as on the larger cultural associations of the South Indian king as protector. This single line of verse becomes further loaded with meaning in the context of the Pārśvābhyaudyā, a narrative structured around the sending of a cloud as a messenger. Through the evocative imagery of Amōghavarṣa’s own name and its articulation with the content of the Pārśvābhyaudyā, Amōghavarṣa is invoked through the standard tropes associated with South Indian kings.

The depth and richness of the Jain praśasti to Amōghavarṣa culminate with Mahāvīrācarya's Gañitasārasamgraha (850 C.E.), a Jain mathematical treatise. The text commences with a description of the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra as a lamp upon the knowledge of numbers that illuminates the entire world. The author Mahāvīra then turns directly from praise of the Tīrthaṅkara to a lengthy praise passage on Amōghavarṣa:

Free from disease and drought, the multitude of animals and plants are delighted by Amōghavarṣa, who desires to do good to all who were dear. His mind's fiery activity reduces his wicked enemies to ash. Therefore, his anger is always fruitful. He brought all the world under his control, but is never under the control of others. Bearing the banner of the shark, the unparalleled god of love, this lord is never defeated. He courageously attacked the Cakravartin empires. In name, he is called the destroyer of the sphere of empires, but in reality, he is the destroyer of the sphere of birth and death. He is renowned as the great ocean of good character, a trove of jewels, the diamond shore of the boundary of good conduct, and the source of the rivers of knowledge. Following the logic of syādvāda, Lord Nṛpatuṅga destroys the one-sided viewpoint. Let his dominion flourish.

---

36 T.V. Mahalingam, South Indian Polity (Madras: University of Madras, 1967), 22.
37 prīṇitaḥ prāṇisasyaugho nirītiniravagraḥ
Full of suggestive imagery, this praśasti aligns the typical qualities of a South India king with Jain ethics. The flourishing of the natural world again echoes the trope of a South Indian king as a bringer of rain employed in Jinasēna’s Pārśvābhyudaya. At the same time, these verses ground Amōghavarṣa within the Jain practice of non-violence (arihmsa); animals and plants adore him for the material prosperity brought about by his reign. Amōghavarṣa is described as a good king because he defeats his enemies, but Mahāvīracārya brings such militancy within the acceptable sphere of Jain behavior by stating that such anger is necessarily “productive” or “fruitful” (avandhya). And again, Amōghavarṣa’s title as a “destroyer,” in reality, indexes his destruction of the cycle of rebirth. The final section presents a conceit (what in Sanskrit poetics is called a multi-part metaphor [sāvayavarūpaka]) that describes Amōghavarṣa as an ocean whose watery landscape teams with virtues. We end with the explicit statement that Amōghavarṣa employs the Jain doctrine of seven-fold prediction (syādvāda) to defeat his opponents who do not adhere to the Jain doctrine of manypointedness (anekāntavāda).  

śrīmatāmoghavarṣena yena svaeṣṭahitaisiṇā || 1.3
pāpārūpāḥ parā yasya cittavrūtthavarbhūjī ||
bhasmasādbhāvāṁ īyus te avandhyakopā abhavat tataḥ || 1.4
vaśīkurvan jagatsarvaṃ svayaṃ nānuvaśaḥ paraḥ ||
nābhībhūtah prabhus tasmād apūrvamakaradhvajah || 1.5
yo vikramakramākrāntacakricakakṛtapakriyāḥ |
cakrikābhānjano nāmnā cakrikābhānjano aṇjasā || 1.6
yo vidyānadyadhīṣṭāno maryādāvajravedikāḥ |
ratnagarbh o yathākhyātacāritrijaladhirmahān || 1.7
vidhvastaikānatapakṣasya syādvādanyāyavādīnaḥ |
devasya nṛpatuṅgaśya vardhatāṁ tasya sāsanaṃ || GSS 1.8

This seven-fold perspectival system is as follows: it exists (syād asti); it does not exist (syād nāsti); it does and does not exist (syād asti nāsti); it exists and is indescribable (syād asti avaktavayah); it does not exist and is indescribable (syād nāsti avaktavayah); it does and does not exist and is indescribable (syād asti nāsti avaktavayah); it is indescribable (syād avaktavayah). This system provides the basis for the central Jain system of logic.
Mahāvīrācarya's subtly recodes Amōghavarṣa as a Jain king by weaving together familiar features of kingship with Jain practice and philosophy. In so doing, he demonstrates how standard features of South Indian kingship accord with a Jain worldview.

What ties together these strategies of eulogization is their form of address. Jain literati created their ideal Jain king through performative strategies that treat Amōghavarṣa as an empty signifier, only to then saturate him with Jain significations. The rhetorical apostrophe is particularly (and perhaps paradoxically) heightened in the use of the third person, a grammatical person that lacks the specificity of the first person and second person designations of "I" and "you." Rather, the third person is not properly a person, but a "non-person" available to be written into being. The third person form common to all praśastis and colophons was a powerful way that individuals and communities in the premodern period could articulate and imaginatively write into being their political desires; the Jain literati of the ninth century did this to great effect. The formal mode of third person eulogy necessitates an object, an object of praise that was more often than not a patron. They transformed the absence of a Jain king into a presence in their intellectual and literary production.

This process culminates with a shift from the third person to the first person that marks the transformation of Amōghavarṣa into a devotee of Jinasēna. In the colphon of the Uttarapurāṇa, Guṇabhadra reflects upon his preceptor Jinasēna's relationship to Amōghavarṣa:


With a lustrous jeweled crown cast in a reddish hue from the pollen of Jinasēna’s lotus-like feet, Amōghavarṣa appeared as if standing inside a waterfall cast from the net of rays emanating from Jinasēna's lofty toenails. The king himself reflected, “Today, I am completely pure.” With glorious and venerable feet, this eminent Jinasēna is the cause of auspiciousness in the world.40

Here, Guṇabhadra depicts Amōghavarṣa prostrating at Jinasēna's feet uttering the statement, "Today, I am completely pure" (pūto 'ham adyēty alaṃ). This image of Amōghavarṣa as supplicant king combined with the king's ascribed statement of purification provided the premise for the widespread historical claim that Jinasēna was Amōghavarṣa's "spiritual preceptor" and that he "converted" him to Jainism.41 I read this account as instead capturing both the revelatory and the contingent quality of religious experience in the archives of this period. I maintain the position that such Jain literary instances are fragmentary, selective, and motivated representations that cannot be easily converted into descriptions of empirical reality. Furthermore, such definitive readings belie the complexity and dynamism that such contingency implies—namely, a medieval king moving in and through multiple religious spheres. My point here is not to dismiss the potency of Guṇabhadra's words, but rather to push us to refine the historical claims that can be made on their basis. What ties Guṇabhadra's colophon together with the other Jain materials of this period is, again, the deep investment in the Sanskrit language and King Amōghavarṣa as ideological vehicles through which they attempted to transform the court into a Jain milieu. To make Amōghavarṣa a Jain is to reduce the multiplicity of

40 yasya prāṃśunakhāṃśujālavisaraddhārāntarāvir bhava-|
tpādāmbhōjarajajayaśiṣaśiṣyāgamukta-pratyagratnadyutīḥ || 1.8
samsmartā svamamōghavarṣanaṃpataḥ pūtōhamadyētyalam
sa śrīman jinasēnapūjyajayāhagavatpādō jaganmaṅgalam || GĀP, 1.9

41 Pollock, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*, 338
possible religious affiliations to a single privileged tie to Jainism.

The literary archive of Amōghavarṣa’s reign explored thus far presents a unique moment of Jain alignment with a particular court. However, these courtly genres and forms of address do not necessarily indicate or attest to a Jain presence within the court itself or the moments of reception by their intended audience. Indeed, the literary and scientific texts produced during the reign of Amōghavarṣa tell us precious little about the institutional status of Jainism within the court or the religious affiliation of the king.

Ugrāditya's *Kalyāṇakāraka* (A Beneficial Practice), a Jain medicinal treatise, suggests that moments of quotidian exchange did, in fact, occur between Jain communities and this court. He ends his text by stating:

> The *Kalyāṇakāraka* is a text of utmost perfection uttered by the Lord of the Jinas that is comprised of eight excellent chapters and generates prosperity. Whoever studies it will directly receive eternal liberation as well as *dharma*, *artha*, and *kāma*.

His feet are worshipped by all kings and celebrated by all people. Through the proficient explanation of the uselessness of flesh, established by the Jainēndra system of medicine, before all of the doctors who guide the group of meat eaters, one becomes famous and is seated near the great King of Kings Śrī Nṛpatuṅgavallabha in the middle of the lofty, great assembly of celebrated and learned scholars.42

---

42

```
yo vā vetti jinendrabhāṣitamidam kalyāṇasatkārakam |
samyaktvottaramaṣṭasatprakaraṇam sampatkaraṇam sarvāḥ ||
so ayaṃ sarvajanaustutah sakalabhūnāthārcitāmghradvayaḥ |
sākṣādakṣayomokṣabhāṇghavati saddharmārthakāmādhikān ||
khyātaḥ śrīnṛpatuṅgavallabhamahārājādhirājajasthitāḥ |
prodyadhūrisabhāṇtāre bahuvidhaprakhyātātvavijāne ||
māsāśiprakarendrājathilabhiṣagvidyāvidāmagrato |
māmsne nispalatāṁ nirūpya nitarāṁ jainendravidyāsthitaṁ ||
ityaśeṣaviśeṣaviśeṣāduṣṭapiśītāsvaivyāvastṛṣu |
māmsanirākaraṇārthamugrādityācaryainrpatuṅgavallabhabhadrasabhāyamudghoṣitaṁ |
prakaraṇaṁ ||
anyaḥ svadoṣakṣtaroganiḥditāmgo |
vadhniṁti karma nijadaṃṣpariṣaṃabhedāt ||
```
Told from a distanced and observational perspective, Ugrāditya’s description of giving a lecture on the merits of vegetarianism is the only extant account of a Jain in Amoghavarṣa’s court. Ugrāditya presents this court as a dynamic intellectual environment amenable to Jainism as well as a persistent site of non-Jain practices (notably, meat-eating). Ugrāditya’s nuanced portrayal of the dynamics of the court is perhaps the closest that we come to a depiction of empirical reality; Amoghavarṣa’s court was a site of incipient possibility rather than a definitively Jain space. What do I mean here by possibility? Ugrāditya's Kalyāṇakāraka most palpably captures the court as a site of potential conversion and writing as a central technology to bring about religious transformation. Ugrāditya's account illustrates a broader Jain investment in writing and in intellectual discourse as an avenue to fame (khyāta). In the last verse, Ugrāditya gives us a very clear gloss on what fame entails: it is proximity to Amoghavarṣa. Through the fame engendered by writing the Kalyāṇakāraka, Ugrāditya is elevated to a seat near Amoghavarṣa. I read Ugrāditya self-reflexive portrayal of Amoghavarṣa’s court as the clearest and most explicit account of broader Jain attempts to advance their religious agenda within a courtly space.

3. A Turn to the Idiom of the Court: Sanskrit Kāvya and the Making of Jain Cosmopolitanism

If the creation of a Jain court required the presence of a Jain king, it equally required inhabiting the courtly aesthetic norm of kāvya, heralding a moment when the Jain community began to look outside itself and to the Sanskrit Cosmopolis. As Jesse Ross notes:

bhāṣitamugrādityairguṇairudāraissamagramugrādityaṃ |
bhāṣitanamitajayamtaṃ samgramugrādityaṃ ||

Ugrāditya, Kalyāṇakāraka: (Rāṣṭrabhāṣānuvādasahita), ed. Varhamāna Pārśvanātha Śāstrī (Solapur: Setha Govindaji Ravaji Dosi, 1940), unnumbered verses, 747-748.
Knutson succinctly put it, “There was no king without kāvya in this world and no kāvya without a king.” Among the available Jain materials from Amōghavarṣa’s court, the poetic works of Jinasēna mark a clear development in how Jains were using Sanskrit in their literary endeavors. Through the idiom of kāvya, Jain authors, starting with Jinasēna, were able to circulate their religious narrative literature within the environment of the court and within a larger imagined social order bound together by Sanskrit and Sanskrit aesthetics. In so doing, Jain poets were key actors working in discrete locals through which the Sanskrit Cosmopolis was produced and reproduced.

I engage in an extended reading of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa in chapter two as the ur-text for the Ādipurāṇa tradition, so here I want to consider his first poetic work, the Pārśvābhuyudaya, that exemplifies this turn towards a greater Jain engagement with Sanskrit court poetry during the medieval period. Through a poetic device called samasyāpūrti—also called samasyāpūraṇa and pādapūraṇa—the Pārśvābhuyudaya incorporates one to three lines of Kālidāsa's Mēghadūta (The Cloud Messenger) within each verse of Jinasēna's original composition in order to narrate the story of the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara Pārśvanātha. Scholarly interest in the Pārśvābhuyudaya has been...
limited to mining the text to recreate Kālidāsa's *Mēghadūta*, an approach that renders the *Pārśvabhuyudaya* a mere depository for a better or more important Sanskrit work. Such a limited reading of the text neglects the very originality that Jinasēna achieved through this particularly innovative use of *samasyāpūrti* and fails to recognize the literary courtly aspirations that motivated Jinasēna's text.

Padmanabh Jaini refers to *samasyāpūrti* as a "favorite pastime of Sanskrit poets." However, within Sanskrit literary theory, this seemingly popular poetic practice largely went untheorized. One explanation for this could be that *samasyāpūrti* was so pervasive that it escaped theorization or that the process of *samasyāpūrti* was primarily

---

message to Śambara's former lover (who was also Pārśva's wife). Śambara, already imagining Pārśva as a cloud, describes in detail the incredibly beautiful landscape that he will observe on the way to their shared love. When Pārśva does not respond to these various methods of distraction Śambara becomes even more enraged. Pārśva's guardian deity, a snake named Dharaṇēndra, intervenes and converts Śambara to the Jainism after which Pārśvanātha achieves liberation.

45 Kalidasa, *The Meghadūta: As Embodied in the Pārśvabhuyudaya with the Commentary of Malinātha Arranged Accordingly and a Literal English Translation, Various Readings, Critical Notes, and an Introductory Essay Determining the Date of Kālidāsa From the Latest Antiquarian Researches* (Poona: 1894).


47 For example, *samasyāpūrti* is not included in the sixteen types of riddles (*prahēlikas*) given in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyadarśa*. Instead, this device first appears in Hēmacandra’s *Kāvyānuśāsana*, a Jain poetic treatise composed in eleventh-century Gujarat. See the commentary on verse 2.10 in which it is referred to as "*samasyāpūrana*" and "*pādasamasyā*." Rasiklal C. Parikh, *Kāvyānuśāsana [with Alaṃkārachūḍāmaṇ and Viveka] by Āchārya Hemachandra with An Anonymous Ṭippaṇa* by Āchārya Hemachandra with An Anonymous Ṭippaṇa, Vol. 1 (Bombay: Sri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya, 1938), 18. Given Hēmacandra’s deep familiarity with Jinasēna's work as evidenced by his *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurūṣacarita* (a Śvētāmbara re-rendering of the Jinasēna and Guṇabhada’s *Mahāpurūṣa*), it seems quite likely that he also read Jinasēna’s *Pārśvabhuyudaya*. It thus makes a great deal of sense that this particular Jain author—having read the *Pārśvabhuyudaya*—would emend the standard list of *prahēlikas* to include *samasyāpūrti*.  

---
practiced in oral courtly culture. This later theory is supported by Allison Busch who notes that such literary usages are the "textual embodiment of the oral practice of samasyāpurti from the courtly sabhā." We, of course, know that medieval Sanskrit literary production was intimately intertwined with oral literacy and presentation in the court, poetic gatherings, or in witty banter with skilled courtesans. This type of collective and social poetic engagement is textually depicted in the Bāllala's Bhōjaprabandha, a collection of fanciful tales about the court of the Paramāra king Bhōja (1011-1055 C.E.). The Bhōjaprabandha also includes many scenes of the poet Kālidāsa masterfully completing samasyāpūrti challenges given to him by his friend King Bhōja. Although echoing the dynamic reduplicated in the Pārśvābhyudaya, the connection between Kālidāsa and samasyāpūrti in the Bhōjaprabandha is purely anecdotal. However, it neatly demonstrates the centrality of oral games, and specifically the practice

---


50 For example, texts like Rājaśēkhara’s Kāvyamīmāṃsā and Kṣemendra’s Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa develop an idealized picture of a day in the life of a Sanskrit poet who dedicates one part of their day to gathering with follow poets in literary salons (kāvyagoṣṭhīs) in which they engaged in oral games like samasyāpūrti. Siegfried Lienhard, A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984), 14-15.; Ali, Courtly Culture and Political Life in Early Medieval India, 87. Furthermore, according to Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra, samasyāpūrti is one of the sixty-four arts over which a skilled and clever woman should have command. Wendy Doniger and Sudhir Kakar, trans. Vatsyayana Kamasutra (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 14-15.

51 Ali, Courtly Culture and Political Life in Early Medieval India, 2.
of samasyāpūrti, within courtly life. The Pārśvābhyudaya is the earliest example we have of the textualization of this oral practice.

While Jinasēna's use of samasyāpūrti is unique within Sanskrit literary history, his invocation of Kālidāsa is not; Kālidāsa was a figure of literary celebrity, and his works circulated immediately and widely within medieval India. From the perspective of Jain poets writing in the medieval Deccan, the centrality of Kālidāsa within the Sanskrit cosmopolis crystalized particularly early vis-à-vis his likely fifth-century date. For example, in a Cālukya inscription at Aihoḷe (634-35 C.E.), the Jain poet Ravikīrti details the lineage of the Cālukya dynasty and the military exploits of his patron Pulakēśī II in aesthetically and metrically complex Sanskrit that echoes themes within Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa.52 This praśasti culminates with Ravikīrti trumpeting his poetic fame through a comparison with Bhāravi and Kālidāsa.53 This inscription illustrates the place that Kālidāsa occupied within the Sanskrit canon and in the minds of Jain literati; he is the poet to whom other poets compared themselves in order to demonstrate their literary merit.

In this vein, Jinasēna's self-consciously invokes Kālidāsa's Mēghadūta within the same verse of praise to Amōghavarṣa referenced above:

This poem, incorporating the cloud poem of Kālidāsa, abounds in virtues, is devoid of faults, and diminishes other poetry. Let it endure until the end of time.

52 F. Kielhorn, “No. 1—Aihole Inscription of Pulikesin II.; Saka-Samvat 556,” EI Vol. 6, 1-12. Kielhorn suggests that verses 17-32, which detail Pulakēśī's territorial conquests, are modeled on Raghu’s digvijaya in chapter four of Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa. Ibid., 4.
53 As gestured to in the introduction, a number of other Jain poets beyond Ravikīrti also emulated and celebrated Kālidāsa. For example, Asaga—a bilingual Sanskrit and Kannada ninth-century poet—wrote the no longer extant Karnāṭaka Kumārasambhavakāvya in Kannada and the Sanskrit poet Jayaśēkhara wrote the Jaina Kumārasambhava.
Let the unfailing rain cloud, King Amōghavarṣa, forever protect the earth.\(^{54}\)

I read this simultaneous poetic eulogization of Amōghavarṣa and Kālidāsa as symbolically expressing Jinasēna’s dual embrace of the king and the larger Sanskrit literary tradition of which Kālidāsa was emblematic. In formally binding his poetry to the poetry of Kālidāsa’s Mēghadūta, Jinasēna positions himself as a worthy and capable interlocutor in direct conversation with the preeminent poet of the Sanskrit tradition.

Jinasēna's selection of the Mēghadūta from among Kālidāsa's oeuvre is again unsurprising. As its title suggests, the Mēghadūta follows the journey of a cloud sent as a messenger from an exiled yakṣa to his bereft lover. This poem inspired countless imitations—with a variety of messengers including clouds, birds, bumble bees, and so on—such that it became a distinct genre called \textit{sandēśa kāvya} or \textit{dūta kāvya}, both which translate to messenger poetry. As Yigal Bronner and David Shulman have noted, \textit{sandēśa kāvya} is "quite possibly the most productive defined genre in all of Sanskrit poetry."\(^{55}\)

They go on to identify a thirteenth-century \textit{sandēśa kāvya} "boom" that generated a substantial amount of poetry that brought to bear the translocal expressive capacity of Sanskrit on distinctly local spaces.\(^{56}\) Predating the bulk of \textit{sandēśa kāvya} by several centuries, Jinasēna's \textit{Pārśvābhyudaya} participates in many features that come to define the \textit{sandēśa} genre while resisting its most prominent feature: localization.\(^{57}\) Rather than

\begin{verbatim}
54  bahuguṇamapadoṣaṁ kālidāsasya kāvyaṁ |
        malinitaparakāvyaṁ tiṣṭhatādāśaśāṅkaṁ
    bhuvanamavatu devassarvadāmōghavarṣaḥ || PA 4.70
56  Ibid., 12.
57  For example, Bronner and Shulman point to Veṅkatādhvarin's \textit{Viśvaguṇādarśacampū}
\end{verbatim}
tracing his local landscape as many later poets do, Jinasēna formally adheres to
Kālidāsa's spatial trajectory through Rāmagiri, the Revā River, the Amrakūta Mountain,
Ujjain, Bhramāvarta, and so on and so forth. For example, Jinasēna describes the cloud
visiting the Āmrakūta Mountain:

When you first ascended to the mountain peak,
doubt was born in the innocent Vidyadhara ladies:
The color of an oiled braid,
is this a black serpent, girthing the mountain in its coils?
Or perhaps it is a garland,
strung with the blue lotuses of the earth-bearing Āmrakūta Mountain?58

The bolded line of this verse is the samasyāpūrti line drawn from verse 1.18 of the
Mēghadūta:

When you first ascended to the mountain peak,
its edges coved with mango trees, shining with ripe fruit appearing like the breast of the world,
dark in the middle surrounded by whiteness,
it is certainly a worthy sight for divine couples.59

Each line of the Mēghadūta verse describing the Āmrakūta Mountain becomes its own
stand-alone verse in the Pārśvābhyaudaya thereby intensifying the landscape found in
Kālidāsa. Yet, the familiarity of the cloud's journey is also transformed into something
entirely new through Jinasēna's graphing onto it a Jain religious world: Rāmagiri is
marked by the footsteps of the Jina, the Mahākāla temple at Ujjain is transformed into a

that uses the genre of Sanskrit messenger poetry to narrate an aerial journey through south
India, and Tamil Nadu in particular. Ibid, 1-2.

58 kṛṣṇāhiḥ kim valayitatanur madhyam asyāṭiśete
kim vā nilotpalaviracitaṃ śekharaṃ bhūbhrataḥ syāt |
ity āṣāṅkāṃ janayati purā mugdhavidyādharīṇāṃ
tvayy āruḍhe śikharam acalaḥ snigdhaveṇīśaraṇe || PA 1.70

59 channōpāntaḥ pariṇatapaladyotibhiḥ kānanāṃrais
tvayy āruḍhe śikharam acalaḥ snigdhaveṇīśavarne |
nūṇaṃ yāsyaty amaramithunaprekaṇīyāṃ avasthāṃ
madhye śyāmāḥ stana iva bhuvāḥ śeṣavistārapāṇḍuh || Mēghadūta 1.18
forest for Śaiva ascetic practice in the middle of which sits the Mahākāla Jain temple, and so on. The locales of the Mēghadūta do not change in the Pārśvābhuyadaya, but are instead elaborately refashioned into a Jain landscape. Within the larger project of Jinasēna and the Jain literati of Amōghavarṣa’s court, the Pārśvābhuyadaya was a text written to transform the cosmopolitan model provided by Kālidāsa into something distinctly Jain. Or, alternatively, Jinasēna’s Pārśvābhuyadaya suggests that Jainism was always already there within the Sanskrit imaginary; it just required a skillful enough poet to highlight its presence.

If Jinasēna's goal was to write a Sanskrit poem that would circulate in the Sanskrit cosmopolis, then he in many ways achieved this goal. Although likely not Jinasēna's intended audience, West Indian Śvētāmbara Jain writers emulated the Pārśvābhuyadaya by writing a surfeit of Sanskrit sandēśa kāvya using samasyāpūrti from the 14th-17th centuries. The samasyāpūrti feature of the Pārśvābhuyadaya meant that it was only legible in Sanskrit. To translate the Pārśvābhuyadaya would be to erase the poetic play enacted in each verse with the creative incorporation of the Sanskrit lines of the Mēghadūta. As such, the Pārśvābhuyadaya provides a model for other poets to use samasyāpūrti in a similar fashion, but it was untranslatable in an increasingly Kannada literary world that develops after the ninth century within the western Deccan. The local in the form of the vernacular was quite literally unavailable as a linguistic avenue for this style of cosmopolitan poetry. By inhabiting the idiom of Sanskrit kāvya, Jinasēna's very goal was to write beyond the local—and we could perhaps include here the internal—and instead reach out to a wider audience for whom such an idiom was meaningful. To make

60 For example, Mēghavijaya’s Mēghadūtasamasyālēkha incorporates Kālidāsa’s Mēghadūta and his Śāntināthacarita incorporates Śrīharṣa’s Naiṣadhīya.
this project even more explicit, the *Pārśvābhhyudaya* incorporates the *Mēghadūta* and, in doing so, reproduces Kālidāsa as the preeminent poet of the Sanskrit cosmopolis. Thus, Jinasēna both inhabits and reproduces the Sanskrit cosmopolis to which he imagines himself addressing his work. It is this type of reproduction—within a field of constant reproductions—that enabled the cosmopolitan literary and cultural formation to obtain consistency and stability; this is what it meant to be Jain and cosmopolitan.

4. Archival Dissonance: The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Jainism

The unique body of Jain Sanskrit texts affiliated with Amōghavarṣa’s court explored above exerted a strong influence over how the history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire was conceived and, in particular, how its inscriptions were interpreted. As highlighted in the introduction to the chapter, out of the succession of Rāṣṭrakūṭas rulers, Amōghavarṣa (800-878 C.E.) is particularly associated with an intensification of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Jain patronage. The pervasive Jain presence in Amōghavarṣa’s literary archive makes such associations seem quite justified. Yet, if we turn to the inscriptive archive, we find quite a different picture. P.B Desai’s volume *Jainism in South India and Some Jain Epigraphs* includes the following heavily damaged inscription of King Amōghavarṣa from Koppal:

(Lines 1-4) “Hail! When the illustrious Nṛpatuṅga Vallabha, destroyer of his enemies, was ruling the earth,.........................having decided ‘this, verily, is the opportune moment!’ and having valorously put up an intensive fight on the field of battle on that day.............the highly praised warrior attained the happiness of the lord of the gods........
(Lines 5-6)........who was a reservoir of great qualities.............in the encounter.⁶¹

Despite its inclusion in a volume on Jain epigraphy, there is no indication of any Jain orientation to this particular inscription. Rather, it reads as a fragmentary eulogy to a hero

---

slain in battle along the lines of a hero-stone (vīrakal) that were common in the medieval Deccan. The basis of Desai’s identification of this inscription as Jain is unclear. Perhaps he extrapolated the inscription’s Jain orientation from its location at Koppal, or Kopaṇa, which rivaled Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa in its importance as a medieval Jain tīrtha. Or perhaps even more troubling, by the mere presence of Amōghavarṣa, a supposedly “Jain king,” Desai back read a Jain affiliation onto an inscription.

The Konnur Inscription found in Dharwar district is another example often cited by Jain scholars, such as Hampana Nagarajaiah, to demonstrate Amōghavarṣa’s Jain affiliation. The first fifty-seven verses of this inscription, which date paleographically to the mid-twelfth century, profess to be a stone copy of a ninth-century copper charter.62 The first two verses read:

(Verse 1.) May the beloved of Fortune, with whom all forms are conjoined, who with his discus destroys the conceits of adversaries, the infinite being before whom bow down the lords of the immortals, the primeval lord Jina, grant to me supreme bliss. (Verse 2.) May the lord Vīra-Nārāyaṇa protect you here, he who rests on the body of (the serpent) Ananta, (and) is the mountain from which rise men of valorous conduct, the progenitor of the mighty race of the excellent Rāṣṭrakūṭas.63

Nagarajaiah reads the parallel invocation of Viṣṇu’s discus and the Jina within the first verse as an example of medieval ecumenicalism; Viṣṇu and the Jina happily exist side by side within a single conceptual and inscriptional space.64 However, a closer inspection of the inscription instead suggests a somewhat sloppy replacement of the Jina for Viṣṇu made by the scribe during the transcription process from the copper-charter to stone.

There are no Jain traces of to be found in the remainder of the praśasti, which instead

62 F. Kielhorn, “No. 4.—Konnur Spurious Inscription of Amoghavarsha I.; Saka-Samvat 782,” EI Vol. 6, 25.
63 Ibid., 34.
64 Hampa Nagarajaih, A History of the Rāṣṭakūṭas of Maḷkhēḍ and Jainism (Bangalore: Anikita Pustaka, 2000), 269.
employs the standard Vaiṣṇava imagery of Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions. For example, the second verse describes Viṣṇu as Vīranārāyaṇa—another common epithet of Amōghavarṣa—and invokes the image of Viṣṇu reclining on the serpent Ananta.\textsuperscript{65} Placed within the larger context of Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions, most notably in the Sañjan Plates of Amōghavarṣa, we find these same two verses reduplicated verbatim without the reference to the Jina making it quite clear the "Jina" of this inscription is an interpolation of what was otherwise a standard Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vaiṣṇava praśasti.\textsuperscript{66}

The body of the Konnur inscription goes on to makes a grant to a Jain temple at the request of the Amōghavarṣa's general Baṅkēya who founded the temple in honor of the Jain ascetic Dēvēndra of the Pustaka Gaccha, of the Dēšiya Gaṇa of the Mūla Saṅgha. This mediated quality of the Konnur inscription is characteristic of Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions of this period, in which we see donations or memorials to specific Jain ascetics and communities made by individuals, organizations, or regional polities framed by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vaiṣṇava praśastis. The Saundatti inscription of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II, Amōghavarṣa’s son, is another example that follows this model with the body of the inscription describing a grant to the Jinēndra Bhavana by Mahāsāmanta Pṛthvīrāma, a Raṭṭa feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, who was a disciple of the Jain ascetic, Guṇakīrti.\textsuperscript{67} In both the Konnur and Saundatti inscriptions, Rāṣṭrakūṭa patronage of the Jain community did not emanate directly from the center, but from intermediaries or feudatories—such as Baṅkēya and Pṛthvīrāma—who cultivated relationships to specific Jain munis and lineages. The material relationship between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Digambara Jain

\textsuperscript{65} The epithet of Vīranārāyaṇa is also found in verse thirty-four of the same inscription.
community of this period is always indirect and expressed through nested sets of relationships within the inscriptive record.

Indeed, despite a sizeable amount of scholarship that has connected the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and Amōghavarṣa to the Jain community of the Deccan there is simply very little epigraphic evidence to substantiate such claims.\(^{68}\) While there are over fifty inscriptions dated to the reign of Amōghavarṣa, only a few inscriptions directly emanate from Amōghavarṣa himself.\(^{69}\) An inscription from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital Mānyakhēṭa dated 871 C.E., is a rare example when Amōghavarṣa fleetingly appears beyond the mode of formal address in the guise of a devotee to the goddess. The donative portion of the grant details the gift of a village to four Brahmans for the maintenance of the *bali*, *caru*, *viśvadēva*, *agnihōtra* and *atithitarpaṇa* sacrifices. However, in the *praśasti* portion we find a more illuminating passage. In verse forty-seven, the grant describes how the king presented his left finger to the Goddess Mahālakṣmi—likely the Mahālakṣmi at Kolhapur—in order to prevent some sort of calamity. It is within this sole epigraph that Amōghavarṣa moves most palpably within the realm of religious practice.

Material patronage of Jainism in the medieval period occurred across all spectrums and scales of authority, however, there is a qualitatively different character between the epigraphical records of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the plurality of regionally based polities of the western Deccan that stretched from Kolhapur to South Kanara. These

---


\(^{69}\) Daya Ram Sahni, “No. 24.—Chhatarpur Copper-Plate Inscription of Govindachandra-deva of Kanauj [Vikrama]-Samvat 1177,” *EI* Vol. 18, 235.
smaller regional polities—including the Gaṅgas of Taḷakāḍ, Kadambas of Banavāsi, the Raṭṭas of Saundatti, the Śīlāhāras of Kolhapura, and the Śāntaras of Huṃca—many of whom were feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, created alternative networks of religio-political relationships through direct material patronage of local Jain ascetics, monastic lineages, and temples. The expression of the relationships that these dynasties maintained with the Jain community were rhetorically standardized with the eight-century records of the Gaṅgas. These records trace the origins of the Gaṅga dynasty to an encounter between the brothers Dadiga and Madhava and the Jain Ācārya Siṃhanandi who obtains the kingdom on their behalf as a boon the Goddess Padmāvati.70 These Gaṅga inscriptions establish a trope of the originating divine intervention of a charismatic monk and/or the Goddess Padmāvati that was taken up by several dynasties including the Raṭṭas of Saundatti and the Śāntaras of Huṃca. What differentiated these smaller regional polities from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is their explicit invocation of Jainism in their epigraphical praśastis that included: an opening invocation to the jinaśāsana (the teachings of the Jina) and/or syādvāda (the Jain doctrine of seven-fold prediction), a dynastic genealogy founded with assistance of a charismatic Jain monk, and, finally, devotion to and the benevolence of the Jain Goddess Padmāvati (often attended by generic devotion to the Jina or, more specifically, to the Tīrthaṅkara Pārśvanātha). For example, the praśasti of Nanni Śāntara includes the following Jain titles: “ornament of the great Ugravaṃśa,” [the lineage of Pārśvanātha], “obtainer of the boon from the Goddess Padmāvati,” and the “worshiper of the feet of the Jina.”71 Through this inscription and others like it, the

71 EC, Vol. 6, introduction, 10.
Śāntaras and similar small-scale dynasties inscribed Jainism into their epigraphical self-presentation, demonstrating the formal ways which medieval dynasties of the western Deccan could be Jain.

It is not just the Vaiṣṇava language, but also the donative objects of Amōghavarṣa’s inscriptions that contradict the image of his court as a deeply Jain literary milieu. There is simply no record of any form of direct patronage by Amōghavarṣa to the Jain community. Rather than attempt to transform this absence into a presence as other scholars have done, I suggest that we should instead grapple with the implications that come from reading literature and epigraphy together, taking the moments of disjunction to be as illuminating as the moments of overlap. Without privileging one archive over another (important given that the medieval epigraphical record is so fragmentary and incomplete), I read the absence of Amōghavarṣa’s material patronage of Jainism as further corroboration that the Jain literature of his court intervened into rather than reflected reality in order to produce the image of an ideal Jain king at a moment when Jain Sanskrit literati were reaching outside of themselves to the court and the broader cosmopolitan world of Sanskrit.

Furthermore, when we read the Jain Sanskrit literature of Amōghavarṣa’s court alongside the inscriptions that emanate from his reign, we uncover quite disparate representations of this king. Amōghavarṣa’s inscriptions offer an alternative vision of his power that was consistently articulated through the language of Vaiṣṇavism. This language and image of the king were also taken up in Śrīvijaya’s Kavirājamārgaṃ explored in the next section. While I will have more to say about the connection between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Vaiṣṇavisim there, I will begin here by noting that by this point
Vaiṣṇavism had become a language of power disaggregated, although not necessarily so, from the practice of Vaiṣṇavism itself. Epigraphs and, in particular, their praṣasti also possess LaCapra’s “work-like” quality much like literature; epigraphy is just as ideologically saturated as literature although the study of South Asian epigraphy has unquestioningly mined these sources for their documentary data. The difference, then, between Amōghavarṣa’s Sanskrit Jain literature and his Vaiṣṇava praṣasti is not necessarily in the contents they disclose (both are invested in forms of representation and religious affiliation), but in the origins of their production. Jain literati addressed themselves to Amōghavarṣa in the linguistic idioms and genres of interest to the king and the court, petitioning to be taken seriously and proposing a vision of cosmopolitanism with Digambara Jainism at its center. The circumstances of the production of royal inscriptions are far less clear. For the most part, it seems that literary and epigraphical poets came from different classes and that the process of inscriptive composition passed through many hands on the way from the court or king, to the poet, scribe, and, finally, onto the stone or copper plate. Unsurprisingly, such inscriptions more often than not bear what we might call the royal stamp of approval. Or, as Whitney Cox notes, “An

72 As Whitney Cox observes, “The epigraphic documents, eminently pragmatic instruments meant to subserve particular projects in a historically distant social and cultural order, were bound up in material and ideological contexts all their own, irrespective of the disciplinary proclivities of their modern interpreters.” Whitney M. Cox, “Scribe and Script in the Cālukya West Deccan,” *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 47.1 (2010): 2. Cox gives several examples of how historians have approached inscriptions, but left out even in his account is the important reading of inscriptions as literary objects in their own right. In reading through the magisterial volumes of Epigraphia Carnatica, Epigraphia Indica, South Indian Inscriptions, etc… one cannot help but take note of the care and attention that early twentieth-century epigraphists gave to inscriptions from dutifully marking their meters to attending to the resonances with literature. For example, see Kielhorn’s reading of the Aihoḷe inscription alongside Kālidāsa’s *Raghuvaṃśa* cited above. F. Kielhorn, “No. 1—Aihoḷe Inscription of Pulikesin II.; Saka-Samvat 556,” *EI* Vol. 6, 1-12.
epigraphic text results from the intersection of several kinds of highly specialized labour and specialist knowledge, often... in the service of the instrumentalities of a premodern state.”73 That is to say, epigraphs reproduce standardized forms of royal representation across time and place—see for example the nearly identical language of the Sañjan Plates and the Konnur Inscription cited above—that seem to emanate from a courtly authority if not the king himself. Therefore, if the Jain Sanskrit literature of Amōghavarṣa’s court addressed and fashioned the king as a Jain then the standardized Vaiṣṇava inscriptions of his reign are a form of self-fashioning that was specifically not Jain. However, as inscriptions from dynasties like the Šāntaras show, Jainism had become a language of political self-fashioning for smaller regionally based dynasties of the western Deccan. Although Jainism was an available avenue for the regional articulation of power, Amōghavarṣa’s epigraphical praśastis specifically invoke the language of Vaiṣṇavism that, I argue, was a method to speak beyond a regional world of the Deccan in which Jainism was meaningful. If Jain literature from this period proposed a Jain cosmopolitanism articulated through Sanskrit and was addressed to the king, then Amōghavarṣa’s inscriptions suggest that Jainism had yet to become a to hand conceptual vocabulary for the translocal articulation of power.

5. The Path of the Poet-King: Kannada, the Kavirājamārgaṃ, and (Alternative) Visions of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Power

While Jain Sanskrit literati predominated in Amōghavarṣa’s court, they were not the only authors and Sanskrit was not the only available language. Śrīvijaya’s Kavirājamārgaṃ, the first extant Kannada language treatise, presents a literary instantiation of a vision of Rāṣṭrakūṭa power that we find in the contemporary

73 Cox, “Scribe and Script in the Cālukya West Deccan,” 3.
inscriptions of the period. At the same time, this text also seems to reflect the presence of its Jain contemporaries in the court. However, the *Kavirājamārgaṃ* is less known as a text that was produced and participated in the literary environment of Amōghavarṣa’s court and, instead through the work of Sheldon Pollock, has become central to how we conceive of the vernacular millennium in premodern South Asia.\(^7\) Through the framework of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyadarśa* (and, to a lesser extent Bhāmaha’s *Kāvyālaṅkāra*), the *Kavirājamārgaṃ* imagines for the first time a Kannada speaking world mediated through, disciplined, and systematized by Sanskrit.\(^5\) Just as I propose that we view the Sanskrit Cosmopolis as made and remade from discrete locals, so too should the vernacular millennium be understood as knit together from a patchwork of different times and places. However, the commonality of the vernacular idiom (in which we identify forms of regional expression as a translocal phenomena) in some ways obscures the dramatically different or even incommensurable ways in which local languages became literary languages and, by extension, the equally different ways in which Daṇḍin’s

---

\(^7\) In the case of Kannada, the vernacular shift that Pollock identifies in this text is heralded through the union of “place” (*dēsi*), the local language of Kannada, and “way” (*mārga*), cosmopolitan Sanskrit. Pollock argues that Kannada’s new status as an elite language was marked by its move from the oral realm to the twinned world of elite cultural production typified by the composition of *kāvya* and *praśasti*. Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, 13.

\(^5\) The *KRM* presents an entirely binaristic relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada that completely ignores the role of Prakrit in the creation and imagination of Kannada as a literary languages. Śrīvijaya’s excising of Prakrit as a translocal literary language that shaped Kannada is particularly peculiar given Kannada bears such an unmistakable imprint of Prakrit. A large number of Kannada words derived from Sanskrit (*tadbhavas*) are actually Prakritisms. For example, while the Kannada *tadbhava* words *kate* (story), *jasas* (fame), and *simga* (lion) do derive from the Sanskrit words *kathā*, *yasas*, and *siṃha*, these forms are first attested to in Prakrit before they make their way into Kannada. Indeed, it appears that Prakrit was an important mediating language between Sankrit and Kannada. Where is Prakrit in Śrīvijaya’s vision of Kannada as a literary language? Why does he write Prakrit out of the picture? These questions, among many others pertaining to the history of the Kannada language, remain to be answered.
Kāvyadarśa was mobilized for particular projects be it religious, political, local and so. In the case of Kannada, we know that Daṇḍin was a critical element of vernacularization, but the circumstances that led to Kannada’s embrace remain opaque or outside of our available theoretical frameworks. I propose that the success and potency of Kannada envisioned through the framework of the Kāvyadarśa in the Kavirājamārgam derives from its alignment with and articulation of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa imperial project. That is to say, the scope of the Kavirājamārgam exceeds the incontestable linguistic and literary paradigm shift that Pollock identifies by giving insight into the broader literary culture in which the Kavirājamārgam was produced and would shape. The Kavirājamārgam has much to tell us about the developing literary culture of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire and beyond as well as the specificity of Amōghavarṣa’s court.

To briefly summarize the work of the Kavirājamārgam, this text is the first account of a South Asian vernacular to emerge onto the medieval literary landscape dominated by Sanskrit. More specifically, the Kavirājamārgam is the first text to theorize a South Asian vernacular as suitable for the writing of literature and, relatedly, for the expression of political power; it is not the first piece of Kannada literature—that honor belongs to Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam—but rather its first theoretical treatise. The Kavirājamārgam wedded Kannada to the framework of Sanskrit grammar and poetics through the union of “place” (dēsi), the local language of Kannada, and “way” (mārga), cosmopolitan Sanskrit. By constantly toggling between the dēsi and the mārga, Śrīvījaya creates an intermediate space for Kannada. The scope of this space is wide-ranging. The text is concerned with what makes a good and a bad poet and, by extension, good and bad

76 Tamil is, of course, the great exception to this narrative in that it existed alongside Sanskrit as a vernacular language.
poetry.\(^{77}\) It has meta-theoretical concerns such as the body poetique (\textit{kāvyapuruṣa}) and its constituent parts of prose (\textit{gadya}) and verse (\textit{padya}).\(^{78}\) Sometimes, Śrīvijaya stays close to Daṇḍin such as in his sections of poetic ornaments related to sound and meaning (\textit{śabda} and \textit{arthālaṅkāras}).\(^{79}\) At other times, he uses Daṇḍin framework such as the category of poetic faults (\textit{dōṣa}) and expands it into something entirely new—perhaps best exemplified by Śrīvijaya’s transformation of Daṇḍin’s translocal northern and southern styles into local styles of northern (\textit{uttaramārga}) and southern styles (\textit{dakṣiṇamārga}) of Kannada.\(^{80}\) He is minutely concerned in delineating the proper relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada, typified at the microlevel by the ways in which words are compounded or used.\(^{81}\) At the same time, he is interested in identifying what is unique to Kannada outside the purview of Sanskrit, including the \textit{bedaṇḍe} and \textit{cattāṇa} genres and \textit{khanda prāsa} in which a poetic fault in Sanskrit is transformed into a virtue in Kannada.\(^{82}\) The text also seems to follow a longer Dravidian tradition of combining grammar and poetic theory into a single theoretical treatise.\(^{83}\) For instance, Śrīvijaya is interested in theorizing aestheticized emotion (\textit{rasa}) and poetic suggestion (\textit{dhvani}) alongside grammatical cases, their optional lengthening, and compounding.\(^{84}\) While it is not all together clear how important or influential Śrīvijaya’s \textit{Kavirājamārgaṃ} was in the broader history of Kannada literature, what is apparent is that this text, written in Amōghavarṣa’s court, transformed Kannada into a literary language. The circumstances

\(^{77}\) 
\textit{KRM}, vv. 1.7-1.22 and vv. 1.28-132

\(^{78}\) 
\textit{Ibid.}, vv. 1.23-27

\(^{79}\) 
\textit{Ibid.}, vv. 2.1-2.14 and vv. 3.1-3.187.

\(^{80}\) 
\textit{Ibid.}, vv. 1.42-1.147 and vv. 2.51-2.111.

\(^{81}\) 
\textit{Ibid.}, vv. 2.92-2.111.

\(^{82}\) 
\textit{Ibid.}, vv. 1.33-1.35 and vv. 1.75-1.77.

\(^{83}\) 
We see this phenomena in, for example, the Tamil \textit{Tolkāppiyam}.

\(^{84}\) 
of Kannada’s adoption by a group of specifically Jain poets is further unpacked here.

This brings us to the question that if Amōghavarṣa’s court was so decidedly Jain and they were so instrumental in the production of a cosmopolitan Rāṣṭrakūṭa literary culture, and Amōghavarṣa himself was possibly a Jain, then how does Jainism fit into the picture of the Kavirājamārgaṃ? As always in this time and place, the Jains are always already there. Śrīvijaya makes two explicit references to Jainism. One occurs in an example illustrating a metaphor that “descriptively qualifies another word” (viśēṣanarūpaka),\(^85\)

“Reflecting the row of divine kings’ supplicant faces, let the Jain monk’s mirror-like toenails reside in my mind.” This is the great metaphor of specification.\(^86\)

And one in an example illustrating the fault of syntactical interruption (vyavahitadōṣa):

Lord Jina! In the mind of those who meditate on you, your sins destroy virtues. Sages also attempt to destroy the cycle of rebirth through service to you.\(^87\)

The corrected syntax of the verse reads:

Lord Jina! In the minds of those who meditate on your virtues, their sins will be destroyed. Sages also attempt to destroy the cycle of rebirth through service to you.\(^88\)

This pair of verses became the basis of the speculative claim that Śrīvijaya himself was a

---


\(^{86}\) jinacaraṇanakhādarśaṃ vinatāmararājājivadanapratimaṃ | manadoḷ sale nilkembudu viniścitaviśēṣaṇōrūpapakam akkuṃ || KRM 3.18 {kanda}\(^87\)

\(^{87}\) manade nenedavara kiḍuguṃ jināthipā ninna pāpanicayam guṇamam | munigaḷum adarīum tatsēvaneyim kiḍipalke pattidar saṃṣṭriyam || KRM 1.91 {kanda}\(^88\) In this instance, Śrīvijaya did not supply a correction for v. 1.91 so I have rendered it here for clarity.
Jain and that the Kavirājāmārgam reflects his religious views—or, even more tenuously, that such Jain religious beliefs support the claim that the Kavirājāmārgam was written by Amōghavarṣa, a “Jain king.” For example, K.B. Pathak, the first editor of the Kavirājāmārgam, says in his introduction to the text that these two verses, “which praises the Jina, reflect the religious opinions of the author. These facts enable us to identify him with the Rāshṭrakūṭa emperor ‘Nṛpatuṅga or Amōghavarṣha I.’” While Amōghavarṣa’s authorship has been largely discarded—as evidenced by the fact that recent editions of the Kavirājāmārgam are attributed to Śrīvijaya—there is still a lingering perception that Śrīvijaya too was a Jain. For example, in an interesting unpublished articled, Gil Ben-Herut suggests that a Jain ethos pervades the ideology of kingship in the Kavirājāmārgam based on its emphasis on tolerance (sairānē). From these examples, he extrapolates Śrīvijaya’s “Jain affiliation.” The various editors of the Kāvirājamārga also chime in on the question of whether Śrīvijaya (or Amōghavarṣa) was a Jain. Based on the presence of the word mahāpuruṣavrata, a Jain specific term for

89 Fleet quoting Pathak in J.F. Fleet, “Kavaśvara’s Kavirājamārga,” IA 33 (1904): 259. Pathak was apparently working with a differently numbered text because he identifies the two verses that explicitly invoke Jainism as v. 1.90 and v. 3.18.

90 Gil Ben-Herut, “Rūpaka Superimposed: A Comparative Look at Rūpakālaṅkāra in the Kāvayādarśa and the Kavirājamārgam,” Unpublished paper, 15. I dispute Ben-Herut’s translation of sairānē as tolerance. Kittle’s entry for sairānē refers us to sayrānē which he describes as a tadbhava of sahana meaning “patience, endurance, forbearance, bearing, enduring.” KED, 1520. Moreover, the first dictionary entries for the Sanskrit word sahana are “powerful or strong.” I have yet to find a specific reference to sairānē as tolerance. This argument for the “Jainess” of the KRM relies on a set of a problematic set of assumptions. Early Jain Kannada writers were not invested in the conception sairānē—as tolerance or otherwise—as a particular quality of kingship. In fact, I have never seen this word used in an Old Kannada Jain text. Therefore, it is difficult to make the point that this was a specifically “Jain” vision of kingship. Moreover, it seems that this word has far broader connotations that unproblematically accord with a pan-South India image of kingship.

celibacy, M.V. Sittaramayya makes the case that the author of the text was a Jain.\footnote{M.V. Sitaramayya, Kāvirājamārgaṃ (Bangalore: Karnataka Sangha, 1975), xxxi. The verse in question that employs \textit{mahāpuruṣavrata} is KRM 3.163. This term was fairly common in this period. For example, it appears as \textit{puruṣavrata} in VAV, v. 1.75.} Krsnamurthy extrapolates the Jainess of Kāvirājamārgaṃ by putting it the broader Jain literary context that included Mahāvīrācarya’s \textit{Gaṇitasārasaṃgraha}, Jinasēna’s \textit{Ādipurāṇa}, and the Jinasēna and Vīrasēna’s jointly composed \textit{Jayadhvalā}, and, finally, the \textit{Praśnōttararatnamālike}.\footnote{K. Krsnamurthy, Kāvirājamārgaṃ (Bangalore: IBH Prakashana, 1983), 39–43.}

The question, then, is how do we evaluate the evidentiary value of such verses within the larger religious landscape of the text? I pose an alternate reading that makes sense of this Jain presence and sensibility. Far from being evidence of Śrīvijaya’s personal Jain religious belief, these verses demonstrate the extent to which Jainism was an entrenched, worlded feature of the medieval western Deccan from which the Kāvirājamārgaṃ draws its quotidian examples. Jainism appears in the Kāvirājamārgaṃ precisely because the text is referencing a world in which Jainism was politically and culturally important; Jainism itself was quotidian. The Kāvirājamārgaṃ pushes us to think of Jainism of this period as a much larger cultural phenomena rather than tied to any one person or a single text. However, due to Jainism’s position within the religious landscape of modern India, it is easy to anachronistically read religious marginality as an historically stable phenomena when, in fact, it is not. Readings that determine the presence of Jain signifiers in the text as proof of an author’s religious affiliation discount this underdetermined, environmentally unremarkable presence of Jainism in the broader social world of the medieval western Deccan. After all, at the moment that the Kāvirājamārgaṃ was composed Jainism and,
more specifically, the Jain literati were so prevalent in Amōghavarṣa’s court that one is hard-pressed to name a single non-Jain author: that author is Śrīvijaya.

There is also further textual evidence that complexifies Śrīvijaya’s interpolation as a Jain. For one, the Kavirājamārgaṃ unmistakably begins with the invocation of the god Viṣṇu as well as King Amōghavarṣa. Jains simply did not commence their texts in this style. Standard Jain practice is to first invoke a specific Tīrthaṅkara and then move through a series of sanctified beings including those fully liberated (siddhas), preceptors (acāryas), teachers (upadhyes), and monks (sādhus) (occasionally a Jain goddess will also be invoked). This conventional opening was routinized to such an extent that I know of no examples that break from this formula. Jain literati were quick to capitalize on the moment of textual opening as a critical site to orient the reader to their religious and political commitments. In this way, Jain literati were typically not subtle about being Jain.

While the Kavirājamārgaṃ captures and absorbs the religious landscape from which it emerged, it was not a religiously motivated text. Instead, I now want to consider the text’s political alignments. As noted, the first verse of the Kavirājamārgaṃ establishes the text’s central orientation:

Śrī is encircled as if by a screen of light
born from the kaustubha jewel
upon the chest of King Nṛpatuṅga,
the endless source of justice, the compassionate.
Because of her love, she does not leave him.

Śrīvijaya commences the text in praise of Amōghavarṣa, equating him with the god

---

94 KRM, v. 1.1.
95 śrī taṭṭuradol kaustubhabājatadyutī bhaḷasī kāṇḍapāṭadantire sam- | Prītiyin ā avanan agaḷ nītinirantarān udāranā nṛpatuṅgan || KRM 1.1 {kanda}
Viṣṇu through the standard image of both the goddess Śrī and the *kaustubha* jewel on his chest.

This verse also contains two of his titles Nītinirantara and Nṛpatuṅga. In the second verse, Śrīvijaya quickly unleashes a further slew of his titles: Amōghavarṣa is “a consummate wrestler” or “the best among those who have done their duty” (*kṛtakṛtyamalla*), “an unopposed hero” (*apratihatavikrama*), “one who is like the God Vīranārāyaṇa” (*vīranārāyaṇan appa*), and “possessed of preeminent fame” (*atiśayadhavaḷa*).\(^96\) Indeed, Śrīvijaya suffuses his text with Amōghavarṣa’s imperial titulature, thereby aligning the *Kavirājamārgam* with standard Rāṣṭrakūṭa epigraphy. For example, his title Nṛpatuṅga occurs thirteen times, Nītinirantara and Atiśayadhavaḷa both occur four times, Kṛtakṛtyamalla three times, Vīranārāyaṇa and Amōghavarṣa twice, and Apratihatavikrama once. While Śrīvijaya does make substantive changes to the framework and contents of the *Kāvyadarśa*, the centrality of Amōghavarṣa within the *Kavirājamārgam* is one of Śrīvijaya’s most unique transformations that, when read alongside the fact that he never once mentions Daṇḍin or Bhāmaha’s name, is all the more stunning. Here we have a rendition of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyadarśa* with no Daṇḍin and, in his place, we find Amōghavarṣa. In some sense then, the *Kavirājamārgam* maintains a similar preoccupation with Amōghavarṣa that we find in the Jain Sanskrit texts from the same court. However, the Amōghavarṣa we find in this text is not a Jain devotee or practitioner of syādvāda. Instead, Amōghavarṣa is represented in what we might call an

\(^{96}\) \(kṛtakṛtyamallan apratihatavikraman osedu vīranārāyaṇan a-|\) \(ppatiśayadhavaḷan namagīgatarkīpasthitapratāpōdayamaṇ || KRM 1.2 \{kanda\}\n
Here I follow Fleet’s translation of *kṛtakṛtyamalla* as “the best among those who have done their duty.” Fleet, “Kaviśvara’s Kavirājamārga,” 261.
imperial epigraphical form. The *Kavirājamārgam* thus provides an important counter optic on the court and on the figure of Amōghavarṣa that seems to contrast with, or at least complexify, the image cultivated in Jain Sanskrit texts.

The persona of Amōghavarṣa is so prevalent within the *Kavirājamārgam* that late medieval and colonial era readers of the text assumed that Amōghavarṣa was, in fact, the author. In Bhaṭṭākalaṅka’s autocommentary to verse 288 in the *Karṇāṭakaśabadānuśāsana* (1604 C.E.), he describes the *Kavirājamārgam* as the “book of Nṛpatuṅga” without any reference to Śrīvijaya.97 Similarly, in 1898 in the Bibliotheca Carnatica series, K.B Pathak published the first edition of the text entitled *Nṛipatunga’s Kavirājamārgga*, again attributing authorship to Amōghavarṣa rather than Śrīvijaya.98 Indeed, the question of the authorship of the *Kavirājamārgam* emerged as the first indological debate to take place in the study of Kannada literature.99

The confusion over authorship lies in the text itself. As we can see from the first verse cited above, Śrīvijaya commences the text in praise of Amōghavarṣa in such a way that strongly suggests that Amōghavarṣa was the patron of the *Kavirājamārgam*. However, Śrīvijaya’s capacious enfolding of this king and his imperial titles into the text exceeds the capacity of a mere patron. With the exception of the text’s opening and close, the king does not occur as an object of poetic praise. Rather, through such frequent

phrases as “in the opinion of the beloved Kṛtakṛtyamalla”

\((kṛtakṛtyamallavallabhamatadim)\), “by treading on the path established by the divine Nṛpatuṅga” \((samucitanrupatuṅgadēvamārgakramagamanābhimukhkal)\), and “going by the path which was described by the great lord Nṛpatuṅga” \((mahānrpatuṅgadēvan ādaradole pēlda mārgagatiyim)\), Śrīvijaya attributes the contents of the text to Amōghavarṣa himself.\(^{100}\) These attributions are again not random. Rather, Śrīvijaya’s citations of Amōghavarṣa strategically frame key moments at which Daṇḍin’s \(Kāvyadarśa\) is incorporated. For example, if we take just the first chapter, Śrīvijaya invokes Amōghavarṣa’s authorizing function in introducing the topic of poetic faults, the body poetique, the specification of genres, and the faults of composition, all drawn directly from the \(Kāvyadarśa\). Inversely, the sections of the text devoted to the specificity of Kannada bear no such attributions. Therefore, it seems quite clear that Śrīvijaya did not ascribe all knowledge to Amōghavarṣa, but rather the particular Sanskritic literary theoretical knowledge of Daṇḍin (and to a lesser extent Bhāmaha). In reference to these attributions, Fleet says,

But it is clear that, whether as a mere compliment or not, the author has sought to represent his patron, not simply as an ordinary patron, or as a mere authority whose views were being cited as a guide, but as the inspirerer of the whole work. And it was, no doubt, a recognition of that intention, coupled with a noticing of the prominent place given in the colophons to the name Nṛpatuṅga which is mentioned so conspicuously in the “the book of Nṛpatuṅga,” in the \(Karnāṭakaśabdānusāsana\) …\(^{101}\)

Fleet accurately identifies how Śrīvijaya’s attribution of content and opinion to Amōghavarṣa was easily transformed into an attribution of authorship. Yet, even if Amōghavarṣa did not pen the \(Kavirājamārgam\) himself, Śrīvijaya’s persistent invocations

\(^{100}\) \(KRM\), v. 1.62, v. 1.147, and v. 2.107.

\(^{101}\) Fleet, “Kavīśvara’s Kavirājamārga,” 268.
of his knowledge and opinions on the proper employment of Daṇḍin’s literary theory evoke an image of the king deeply interested in shaping the parameters of courtly language and literature in a distinctly Sanskrit fashion.

Śrīvijaya’s incorporation of the figure and ideas of Amōghavarṣa part and parcel with his imperial titles was not an ideologically neutral or passive endeavor. The text pointedly opens up with an image that equates Amōghavarṣa with the God Viṣṇu through his relationship with the Goddess Śri and his possession of the kaustubha jewel: “Śrī is encircled as if by a screen of light born from the kaustubha jewel upon the chest of King Nṛpatuṅga…”

The Vaiṣṇava allusions in the text continue with Śrīvijaya’s employment of Amōghavarṣa’s title Vīranārāyaṇa, a title that again equates the king with the god Viṣṇu. In reproducing this equation between king and god, Śrīvijaya inhabits the standard imagery of Rāṣṭrakūṭa praśastis in which Amōghavarṣa appears as Vīranārāyaṇa. For example, as found in the Sañjan Plates, one of Amōghavarṣa’s most common and oft-repeated praśasti is as follows:

May the lord Vīranārāyaṇa [Viṣṇu] himself protect you here, who is all-pervading, who rests on the body of (the serpent) Ananta, who is the mountain of valor, character, and greatness, and who is the progenitor of the lofty line of the good Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

May that Vīranārāyaṇa [Amōghavarṣa] himself protect you here, who is powerful, who lives in endless enjoyments, who is the rising mountain of valor, character, and greatness, and the ancestor of whose lofty line was the good Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

I would argue that Vaiṣṇavisim and, in particular, the figure of Nārāyaṇa quickly became central to Rāṣṭrakūṭa epigraphical self-expression. Both Amōghavarṣa I and

---

102 KRM, v. 1.1.
103 Ibid., v. 1.2 and v. 3.181.
104 Retranslated from Bhandarkar, “No. 26.—Sanjan Plates of Amoghavarsha I,” 251, v. 2.
Amōghavarṣa II was styled Vīranārāyaṇa, Gōvinda III was called Kirtinārāyaṇa, and Gōvinda IV was known as both Vīranārāyaṇa and Virkantanārāyaṇa. Thus, Śrīvijaya’s opening verse and scattered references to Vīranārāyaṇa further locate the text within a specifically Rāṣṭrakūṭa political world.

Here, I read Śrīvijaya as deeply invested in producing and reproducing an established idiom of Rāṣṭrakūṭa power. He was a sort of company man if you will. But the Kavirājamārgaṃ was not just a reproduction that aligned the text with a Rāṣṭrakūṭa imperial project; it also sought to enhance the king’s persona by transforming him into an authorial voice. In reconceiving Kannada through the Kāvyadarśa, Śrīvijaya figures Amōghavarṣa as Daṇḍin himself, suggesting that the heralded status of the Kavirājamārgaṃ within Kannada literary history might have had less to do with Daṇḍin than we might think and far more to do with Amōghavarṣa. The Kavirājamārgaṃ was not a royal path of poets, but rather the path of the poet-king Amōghavarṣa. One of the great curiosities of the early medieval period is that in Amōghavarṣa’s court we have a sudden surfeit of Jain Sanskrit writing (Jinasēna, Ugrāditya, et al.) and by the next century Jains almost entirely abandon Sanskrit for Kannada in their literary production (Pampa, Ranna, et al.). Given the Jain preoccupation with Amōghavarṣa, I argue that the tenth-century Jain embrace of Kannada was precipitated by the Kavirājamārgaṃ, which, as we already know from Bhaṭṭākalaṅka’s Karnāṭakaśabadānuśāsana, was known as the “book of Nṛpatuṅga.” Amōghavarṣa’s authorizing voice in the Kavirājamārgaṃ yielded a new political language for the Jains to use for their own religious ends—in a similar way

that they turned to Sanskrit in the ninth century. I return to the Jain use of Kannada in the fourth chapter.

6. The *Praśnōttaratnamālikē* and the Culmination of the Jain Project of Amōghavarṣa’s Court

On the one hand, the image of Amōghavarṣa as litterateur that Śrīvijaya develops in his *Kavirājamārgām* (and his later reception as that text’s author) and, on the other hand, his supposed Jain religious commitments reaches a point of ideological saturation in a text ascribed to Amōghavarṣa, entitled the *Praśnōttaratnamālikē* (The Jeweled Garland of Questions and Answers). The final line of this text describes Amōghavarṣa as both author and renunciate:

This beautifully ornamented *Ratnamālikā*, a veritable jeweled garland, was composed by the wise Amōghavarṣa who renounced his kingdom.\(^{106}\)

And, indeed, this line is the most powerful statement that Amōghavarṣa was himself an author and Jain adherent. In this section, I explore the *Praśnōttaratnamālikē*’s claim that Amōghavarṣa renounced his throne according to Jain practice. I begin with the various recensions of the *Praśnōttaratnamālikē* and the complexity in determining its authorship. Read in the broader context of medieval South Asia, the *Praśnōttaratnamālikē* circulated widely as an important (and apparently popular) text to which religious communities laid claim to by attributing its authorship to a consequential figure within their tradition. For the Deccani Digambara Jains, this figure was Amōghavarṣa. With its ascribed authorship to Amōghavarṣa, I argue that

\[\text{vivekāt tyaktarājyena rājñeyam ratnamālikā |}\
\text{racitāmoghavaraṃ saudhyā sadłaṅkṛtiḥ || 30 via Mahisavadi, B.B, ed. \textit{Amōghavarṣa Nṛpatuṅga Viracita Praśnōttara Ratnamālikā} (Dharward: Jnanavikasa Prakasana, 1977), 32.}\]
Praśnōttararatnamālike captures the ways in which the symbolic representation of Amōghavarṣa was reproduced, translated, and made common sense for medieval Digambara Jains. I then turn to two inscriptions that seem to support the image of Amōghavarṣa in the Praśnōttararatnamālike as renunciate Jain king. Rather than reading these disparate materials as mutually reinforcing, I untangle the ways in which the renunciate Amōghavarṣa was mobilized in literature and epigraphy for different religious and political ends. Ultimately, I argue that the figure of Amōghavarṣa as he moved through different cultural mediums facilitates a collapse between religious and political spheres, foreshadowing a similar conflation that later Ādipurāṇas would enact.

Structured around a set of questions and answers (praśnōttara), this text presents a series of ethical maxims, such as: What is the highest path? Dharma. The broad applicability of its content presented in an accessible didactic mode made this text an appealing site for co-optation. The large number of recensions—often accompanied by rich sectarian commentarial traditions—produced across the subcontinent in the early medieval period is reflected in the text’s many names. It is variously called the Praśnōttararatnamālā, the Praśnōttaramālikā, the Praśnōttararatnamālikā (Kannada, Praśnōttararatnamālike), the Ratnamālikā, the Vimalapraśnōttararatnamālā, and

Vimalapraśnōttararatnamālikā.\textsuperscript{108} In 1858, Antonius Schiefner published a Tibetan version with German translation entitled the *Dri ma med pa’i dris lan rin po che’i phreng ba* (Sk. *Vimalapraśnottaratnamālā*), based on two different recensions found among the bstan-’gyur manuscripts (known as the Tengyur or Tandjur). Schiefner notes that the text is attributed to Don yod ‘char—or Amōghadaja (Amōghadaya) when back translated into Sanskrit—whom the text describes as both a “respected author as well as a great king.”\textsuperscript{109} Given its location within the Buddhist Tengyur manuscripts, Schiefner unquestioningly reads the text as Buddhist and Amoghadaja as a corrupted form of the Buddhist Kuninda king Amoghabuti.\textsuperscript{110} In 1867, P.É. Foucaux published a Śaiva recension attributed to the Advaita Vedanta Acārya Śaṅkara based on a Sanskrit manuscript he acquired in Bombay accompanied by a French translation.\textsuperscript{111} Foucaux questions Śaṅkara’s authorial attribution, suggesting instead that a later scholar, who

\textsuperscript{108} As we will see, this text is claimed by a number of traditions as such is goes by a number of titles, However, in the following pages I will exclusively use Ratnamālika, the title of the Deccani recension of the text. For a discussion of the contested authorship of this text see Altekar, *The Rashṭrakūṭas and Their Times*, 88-89 and Suniti Kumar Pathak, *The Indian Nītiśāstras in Tibet* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974), 29-32.

\textsuperscript{109} Schiefner, *Carminis Indici «Vimalapraṇottararatnamālā» Versio Tibetica*, 2.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 3. Comprising over two hundred volumes, the Tengyur manuscripts contain some of the earliest receptions of Indian Buddhism and Indian intellectual thought into Tibetan and, along with the Kangyur, form the basis of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon. The manuscripts include works on grammar, philosophy, and, of course, the *Vimalapraśnottaratnamālā*. Due to their perceived antiquity, Albrecht Weber agrees with Schiefner that the Tibetan version was likely the oldest and that its content also suggests Buddhist origin. Albrecht Weber, “Ueber die Praṇottaratnamālā: Juwelenkranz der Fragen und Antworten,” in *Indische Streifen: Eine Sammlung von Bisher in Zeitschriften Zerstreuten Kleineren Abhandlungen*, Vol. 1 (Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1868), 212-213.

\textsuperscript{111} This manuscript also included a Marathi paraphrase that Foucaux chose not to publish out of concern that it would not interest his European readers. Foucaux, *La Guirlande Précieuse des Demandes et Des Réponses*, 9.
compiled the text, attributed it to Śaṅkara to enhance its authority.\footnote{Ibid., 6.} The body of his introduction focuses on the proximity between Śaivas and Buddhists in the Himalayan region, which he suggests accounts for their mutual interest in this text.\footnote{Ibid., 7.} However, in a footnote, Foucaux reveals that shortly before publication he received another Sanskrit manuscript of the same text attributed to the Śvētambara Jain guru Asitapaṭa, but he fails to comment on how a Jain edition changed his understanding of the text as a product of specifically Himalayan religious interaction.\footnote{Ibid., 8, fn. 1.} In 1891, the Kāvyamāla series published another Śvētambara Jain Sanskrit version attributed to monk Vimala. The textual trajectory of this notionally Buddhist, Śaiva, and Jain text is further expanded by another Śvētambara Jain version, composed in Prakrit by Ṛṣyuttama, published in the original with Italian translation by P.E. Pavolini in 1898. Pavolini succinctly observes that the majority of these editions rarely differ more than the first and last verse.\footnote{Pavolini, “Una Redazione Pracrita Della Praṇottararatnamālā,” 154.} Perhaps unsurprising there is another version (and likely more) that escaped the attention of early European Indologists translating this text into European languages; it was produced by the Deccani Digambara Jains who attribute the text’s authorship to Amōghavarsa in the guise of an author and renunciante Jain king.\footnote{Sheldon Pollock has produced the text of this recension attributed to Rāṣṭrakūta king Amōghavarsa in an unpublished paper dated 1994, which he generously shared with me.} Although not published until 1977, Amōghavarsa’s Praṇottararatnamālike circulated widely in manuscripts held at the Jain mathās of the Kannada speaking region and was cited by late colonial scholars including
R.G. Bhandarkar. The Deccani Digambara Jains too participated in laying claim to the ethical maxims contained within the Praśnottararatnamālikē. This manuscript history concretely demonstrates a fact we know to be true, but whose proof often proves to be illusive: namely, the connections maintained by spatially and temporally diffuse communities of Jains, Buddhists, and Śaivas. Why does such a history matter?

The complex textual and circulation history of the Praśnottararatnamālikē makes any attempt to pin down its author a futile endeavor given that the most notable feature of the text itself are the ways in which regionally based religious communities sought to lay claim to it through the very fact of authorial attribution rather than through reshaping its content. One feature that all these recensions share is a single verse in which the word vimala appears. Through a double entendre, the verse can be read in two ways:

Who, indeed, is not ornamented by the flawless jeweled necklace of questions and answers encircling the neck?

Who indeed is not ornamented by Vimala's jeweled necklace of questions and answers residing on the tip of his tongue.

Here the word vimala can act as an adjective meaning “flawless” or “pure,” but it can also reference a proper name. The dual referent of vimala is heightened through the double meaning of the word kaṇṭhasthita, which can mean “situated on the neck” or “on

117 For the first, and to my knowledge only, publication of the Deccani Praśnottararanamālikē see Mahisavadi, Amōghavarṣa-Nrpatuṅga Viracita Praśnottara Ratnamālikā. Bhandarkar, Early History of the Dekkan Down to the Mahomedan Conquest, 69.

118 kaḥ khalu nālaṃkriyate drṣṭārdṛṣṭārthasādhanapaṭīyān | kaṇṭhasthityā vimalapraśnottararatnamālikāyā ||
the tip of the tongue” or even “committed to memory.” In almost all of the recensions, this verse comes after the invocatory verse to Mañjuśrī, Vardhamāna, Śiva, and so on, acting as a secondary praśasti verse either in praise of the author or of the text itself. I argue that much of the confusion over authorship depends on how one renders the compound “vimalapraśnōtararatnamālikā” either as “Vimala's jeweled necklace of answers and questions” or “the flawless jeweled necklace of questions and answers.” As communities sought to make sense of this verse, Vimala appears as the author in multiple traditions. For example, the West Indian Śvētāmbara Jain recensions attribute it to the Jain monks Vimala (typically understood to be Vimalasūri) and Asitapaṭa.119 The Advaita Vedantan or Tamil Śaiva recension attributes it to Śaṅkarācārya or to his teacher Vimala.120 The Deccani Digambara Jain recension assigns authorship to King Amōghavarṣa. The Tibetan translation of this text, Dri ma med pa'i dris lan rin po che'i phreng ba (Sk. Vimalapraśnottararatnamālā), maintains an attribution to Vimala (Dri ma med) in the title while also reproducing the final line about Amōghavarṣa (Don yod 'char) found in the Deccani Jain recension. This suggests that the Tibetan recension preserved a connection to the West Indian Śvētāmbara Jain and/or the Advaitan Vedantan textual traditions surrounding Vimala as well as to the Deccani Digambara Jain recension’s


relationship to Amōghavarṣa.\textsuperscript{121} Whether they rendered \textit{vimala} as a person or an adjective, Buddhists, Jains, and Śaivas engaged in making the \textit{Praśnōttararatnamālike} their own through authorial attribution. The Deccani Jain attribution to Amōghavarṣa, then, fits within an established pattern: for this community Amōghavarṣa, an ideal Jain king, was elevated to the level of Śaṅkarācārya or Vimalasūri. In recension after recension, the \textit{Praśōttararatnamālie}’s plasticity frustrates any attempt to recover the author as historical fact.

And yet, scholars of Karnataka and Jainism, as well as Jains themselves—likely working without access to this larger and more complex textual history—desire to read the \textit{Praśnōttararatnamālike} as an empirical record of Amōghavarṣa’s authorship and renunciation.\textsuperscript{122} How else might we read Amōghavarṣa within this text? I argue that Amōghavarṣa’s elevation to author of the \textit{Praśnōttararatnamālike}—and its description of his royal abdication—aligns both with the ways in which premodern communities claimed this text as well as represents a culmination of a set of literary strategies in which early medieval Jain authors sought to address Amōghavarṣa as an ideal Jain king. Within the larger Jain agenda of this period, the \textit{Praśnōttararatnamālike} completes Amōghavarṣa’s transformation into an ideal Jain king by placing the words of renunciation in his mouth. Thus, regardless as to whether the \textit{Praśnōttararatnamālike} archives fact or fiction vis-à-vis the king’s renunciation, it clearly captures a different kind of historical fact: the aspirational or purposive quality of archives as shaped by the

\textsuperscript{121} I am indebted to Erin Epperson and Connie Kassor for their help with the Tibetan contents of this section.

\textsuperscript{122} Pathak also notes that the content of the Tibetan version and the Deccani Jain versions are quite close. The Jain version contains twenty-seven \textit{ślōkas} and the Tibetan twenty-two. Pathak, \textit{Indian Nītiśāstras in Tibet}, 24 fn. 110 and 30.
ideologically driven desire of the materials they contain. For medieval Digambara Jains, to be a Jain king was not simply to believe or to practice syādvāda as Mahāvīrācārya describes Amōghavarṣa in his Gaṇitasārasamgraha, but necessitated relinquishing one’s throne in favor of asceticism. As we will see again and again in later chapters on the Ādipurāṇa tradition, an ideal Jain king is one who renounces their kingdom.

The image of Amōghavarṣa as renunciate Jain king is not the purview of the Praśnottararatnamālike alone. An undated inscription on the wall of the Rāvaṇa Temple at Aihole records the following statement: “while the glorious Amōghavarsha is reigning again” (śrīamōghavarṣam navarājyaṃ geye). This inscription employs a common Kannada verbal phrase “rājyam geye,” which translates to “to administer the kingdom,” or, more generally, “to rule” or “to reign.” In the case of this inscription, the adjective “nava,” meaning fresh or new, is applied to the kingdom (navarājya) giving it the sense of when Amōghavarṣa was reigning again or newly reigning. Given its undated quality, the Aihole inscription could, of course, refer to the beginning of Amōghavarṣa’s reign. However, the Sañjan Plates dated to 871 C.E. present a similar picture of Amōghavarṣa’s intermittent royal tenure. The inscription states, “But he, who gave away more than once his own kingdom, insignificant (to him), (saying): ‘of what account are the external object…[yenātyāji tanuḥ svarājyam…].’” The editors of these inscriptions interpret their historical implications slightly differently. Reading the Sañjan Plates literally, D.R. Bhandarkar suggests that they demonstrate, “that a king could in ancient times

---

123 Fleet’s translation accurately captures the sense of this line so I follow him here. J.F. Fleet, “A Note on Amoghavarsha I,” IA 20 (1891): 114. The bracketed transliteration is my own produced from the original inscription published in SII Vol. 11, no. 18.
124 We find this verbal phrase in inscriptions, but also in early Kannada literature. For example, it is used in PĀP, v. 1.78.
temporarily resign his sovereignty and enjoy the life of a hermit or ascetic.” J.F. Fleet too reads the Aihoḷe inscription literally as a record that “…indicates distinctly a definite break in his long reign.” However, he then turns to the figurative possibilities that might account for such a break in Amōghavarśa’s rule. He asks, “Can anything be gathered from any literary Praśasti, to show plainly that he voluntarily abdicated for a time? Or is it possible that the verse in the Praśnōttara-Ratnamāli is euphemistic; and that, in reality, he was overthrown for a time by the Eastern Chalukya king Vijayāditya, in the course of the twelve years’ war that he waged with the Rāṣṭrakūtas…” So, on the one hand, we have an image of Amōghavarśa for whom the practice of royal renunciation was not an all or nothing endeavor (and the implied possibility of royal receivership), on the other hand, renunciation as standing in for the forcible loss of the kingdom. What units these two readings is the presence of a Jain discourse in which interruptions or devolutions of political sovereignty are recast as gains of spiritual sovereignty. That is to say, whether Amōghavarśa chose to renounce or forcibly renounced his kingdom, Jainism provided a language through which the topos of renunciation was sufficiently flexible to apply to a multiplicity of cases.

I suggest in this section that the question of Amōghavarśa’s religious affiliation, a thread that runs through both premodern and colonial era sources, is far less interesting than the ways in which the figure of Amōghavarśa as a renunciant king was mobilized in

126 Ibid., 242. Along this same line of thinking, David Shulman notes, “Often we may suspect that the idiom of tyāga [renunciation] masks a reality in which the king’s control over his proper ‘share’ is somewhat theoretical; at times he quite clearly renounces what he in any case lacks the power to appropriate.” Shulman, The King and the Clown in South Indian Myth and Poetry, 23.
literary and epigraphical sources. As we have seen, premodern religious communities throughout the subcontinent sought to claim the expansive content of the

Praśnōttararatnamālike as their own by assigning authorial attribution to an important figure within their various traditions. What is important about this text, then, is not the historical verifiability of these claims to authorship, but rather the act of authorial ascription that functioned as a religiously laden act. The Deccani Digambara Jain ascription of Amōghavarṣa as the text’s author and the text’s account of his royal renunciation represents a culmination of literary strategies through which the Jain community from the Kannada speaking region sought to imagine him as an ideal Jain king. In so doing, this community of Digambara Jains engaged with this text in precisely the same way as their Tibetan Buddhist, West Indian Śvētāmbara Jain, and Tamil Śaiva counterparts; the names change, but the function of the author is the same. In the case of the Digambara Jains, their assignment of authorship to Amōghavarṣa, as well as their claim about his renunciation, seems to be buttressed by the epigraphical record from the period. Yet, these two textual media do quite different ideological work. On one hand, the Praśnōttararatnamālike mobilizes Amōghavarṣa as an emblematic political figure through which to articulate a very specific notion of Deccani Digambara Jainism. Put simply, politics is placed in the service of religious claims. On the other hand, the epigraphical sources mobilize the religious act of renunciation in order to make sense of interruptions in political sovereignty. Here, religion explains—or, at least, fills an interpretive void regarding—political instabilities in his reign. In all cases, the figure of the king serves as a staging ground where different desires, projects, and interpretive protocols come into contact. In the process, the conceptual articulation between Jainism
and kingship tightened, rendering commonsensical the collapse between the two that the subsequent Ādipurāṇas would perform.

7. Conclusion

This chapter highlights several interrelated developments connected with Amōghavarṣa’s court including, perhaps most notably, the Jain adoption of Sanskrit as their principle language of intellectual and poetic expression. The remarkable concentration of Jain literati associated with this particular court represents a moment when the Digambara Jain community of the Deccan began to look outside of itself to the broader cosmopolitan world accessible through the powerful tool of Sanskrit writing. What is notable about this moment is not just the mere fact of linguistic choice, but the various ways in which Jain Sanskrit authors addressed themselves to Amōghavarṣa, imaging him as an ideal Jain king. However, I argue that these two phenomena are connected: Jain Sanskritic courtly aspirations cohered in and around Amōghavarṣa, saturating the cipher-like persona of the medieval South Indian king with specifically religious content. To this end, Jain literati entered into the court, thereby transforming its literary output and intervening into its forms of reproduction. Although they composed in the classic genres underpinning courtly life and political power (grammar, mathematics, poetry, and so on), Jain literati reframed these genres to their own ends in ways that routinized Jainism as a quotidian feature of courtly life, a quotidianness that comes to fruition in Śrīvijaya’s Kavirājamārgaṃ. As we saw with the Jain literati of Amōghavarṣa’s court, grammar is not just any grammar, but specifically the Jain system of grammar (jainēndravyākaraṇa); math is used for calculating the world, a world comprised of the court, the Jain temple, and the countryside; Jain medicine cures, but it
also brings great fame expressed through proximity to Amōghavarṣa; and Jain kāvya contains within it and supersedes the preeminent poet of the Sanskrit tradition. As much as Jains went to the court as a site of power and access as typified in their adoption of courtly literary norms, they also sought to draw out the power of the court into the religious sphere embodied in their transformation of Amōghavarṣa into a Jain king. The effect of these movements, irreducible as it were to a single text, was to conceptually collapse the seemingly disparate political and religious spheres. If we follow the logic and literary textures of these sources, if we take them seriously, then this how we get a Jain court with a Jain king.

The connections between Amōghavarṣa’s court and the Ādipurāṇa tradition track across this interrelated set of developments. As I explore in the third chapter, the Jain poet Jinasēna composed the first Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa within this literary milieu and his text bears its imprint. Although titled a purāṇa (an important Jain genre that did similar work to biography), Jinasēna goes to great lengths both to interpret as well as to enact his Ādipurāṇa as a Sanskrit court epic or mahākāvya. With its generic and formal poetic commitments, Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa represents the pinnacle of Jain courtly literary aspirations and attempts at cosmopolitan belonging. Again this is not just an issue of linguistic or generic choice rather Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa also participates in a Jain ideological investment in the figure of the king common to the Jain Sanskrit literature of this period. Jinasēna is less interested in the specificity of Amōghavarṣa and more interested in capturing the ways in which kings (inextricably bound as they were to Sanskrit courtly genres) were mobilized to move between religious and political spheres, in effect rendering them one. I read Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa as a metatheoretical reflection
upon the connection between Jainism and kingship, a connection that the Jain Sanskrit poets of Amoghavarśa’s court collectively sought to make real. Jinasēna theorizes kingship from a Jain perspective not through philosophical discourse, but in the idiom of the court, the targeted space of his theoretical intervention.

Jinasēna established the Ādipurāṇa narrative as a suitable topic for Sanskrit courtly literature and theoretical investigation, but the world of Amoghavarśa’s court already contained within it in Śrīvjiaya’s Kavirājamārgam a momentous sea change away from Sanskrit to the vernacular, a change that would largely come to define South Asian literature in the second millennium. If Amoghavarśa’s court is remarkable for what appears as a sudden Jain shift to Sanskrit as their language of choice then it is also notable that this happened at precisely the same moment that Kannada became an available literary register. While Jains did not abandon Sanskrit entirely after its heyday in Amoghavarśa’s court, from the tenth century onwards the majority of their compositions were in Kannada. After centuries of composing at the boundaries of elite courtly literature, the Digambara Jain writing in Sanskrit community moved to its center, becoming the predominate elite literary class within the region. There is simply no record of any other community as focused, motivated, and productive within the early medieval period of the Deccan. As we will see in the later chapters of this dissertation, Jain literati continued to improvise with literary style, foster new genres, and cultivate languages in new and exciting ways with the Ādipurāṇa narrative.
CHAPTER 2

Connective Tissue: Literati, Texts, Polities

1. Introduction

The picture of Jain activity in Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amōghavarṣa’s court developed in the previous chapter captures the ways in which ninth-century Jains began to actively cultivate Sanskrit as an avenue of cosmopolitan belonging. With a focus on the king, Jains penetrated into the upper echelons of the court by producing texts as much invested in the reproduction of political power as in the reproduction of Jainism itself or, perhaps more accurately, a hybrid of the two. It should not surprise us that Jains mobilized literature for political and religious ends. Sheldon Pollock, for instance, has brought to life the ways in which arcana grammatical knowledge underpinned premodern South Asian modes of political self-fashioning.129 In the case of Amōghavarṣa’s court, all knowledge—be it of grammar, math, or medicine—was rooted in Jain forms of worldly understanding (this was, after all, specifically Jainēndra forms of grammar, math, and medicine). Read in this way, Amōghavarṣa’s court was a moment in which Jainism itself exceeded containment as a merely religious phenomena and became legible as a larger cultural force. Jainism was part of a broader landscape of elite cultural production. While Jain literati desired to convert or, at the very minimum, imagine Amōghavarṣa as an ideal Jain king, the novelty of their collective project was in demonstrating that religious belief and sensibility does not necessarily adhere in a single individual or community. Rather, such beliefs and feelings can become a worlded and entrenched feature of an institution.

or culture, as reflected in Śrīvijaya’s *Kavirājamārgam*. In this way, the ninth-century Deccan witnessed a Jain ascendancy that registered far beyond the purely theological.

Scholars of medieval South Asia have typically read medieval texts either as expressions of an autonomous religious and theological domain or as the embodiment of cosmopolitan and courtly self-referentiality.\(^{130}\) The upshot of this binary mapping is that few have considered the central role that literary practice and literate classes played in mediating *between* the different institutional worlds of temple and court. As we will see, the Jain literati of Amōghavarṣa’s court and beyond held complex and overlapping social positions ranging from Jain layman to military general; much like their literary texts, they circulated within broader networks of individuals and across heterogeneous institutions.

Within this same vein, scholarship has equally ignored the ways in which the nested character of medieval South Asian polities facilitated the flow of these individuals and their texts in ways that reproduced the cultural production of the imperial at its peripheries. Jain literati and their texts were the connective tissue that scaled across political units from the imperial to the feudatory, from the translocal to the local, and from the center to the periphery.

Taking into account these scholarly lacunas, I examine the enduring afterlife of the literary and religious developments of Amōghavarṣa’s court. I begin by thinking about the Rāṣṭrakūṭa imperial formation and its constitutive political parts, specifically the Eastern Cāḷukya and Western Gaṅga dynasties. I argue that while historians have productively shown how such alliances functioned as avenues of political-ideological

\(^{130}\) Both Daud Ali and Sheldon Pollock have tended to approach the court and its cultural production from this angle. Daud Ali, *Courtly Culture and Political Life in Early Medieval India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Sheldon Pollock, *Language of the Gods*. 
circulation (of vocabularies of power, symbols of sovereignty, royal titulature, and so on), they have ignored the importance of political relationships as conduits of artistic, cultural, and religious exchange and connectivity—or, vice versa, the critical ways in which broader cultural and religious connectivity facilitated political stability. Moving in both directions, it is through such connected networks that linguistic and literary styles and tastes crystalized and took hold and were mobilized for political expression. In making this argument, one of the main themes of this dissertation comes to the fore: beyond military engagement and taxation, political power was most robustly performed in and through art and culture. Plainly put, cultural power was central to the reproduction of political power. In making this claim, I am not suggesting that culture worked to legitimate any given political order. The structure of feudal empire and the ideology of imperial kingship discounted “legitimacy” as a political problematic. Instead, culture reproduced political power to the extent that it provided political elites an occasion to reflect upon their own power. Here I follow James Scott, who wryly observes of a modern Laotian liberation day parade, “virtually no one comes to see it save those on the reviewing stand and those marching past.”¹³¹ Such instances attest to the fact that symbolic cultural power—in military parades, Sanskrit kāvya, or Italian opera—did not produce real power in a coercive or violent sense. Rather, this type of enactment of power enabled elites to accumulate power within their own class as the court with the best poetry, the most beautiful art, and so on. Pierre Bourdieu comes closest to giving us an account of the dynamics symbolic power in which distinctions occur within a class and

not necessarily vertically across class sections. What Scott observes and Bourdieu captures is similarly present in the courtly productions of the early medieval Deccan: power required no audience beyond power. This point is made even clearer by the fact that elite courtly literature and even royal inscriptions were functionally illegible to the vast majority of people in the medieval period. For a broader, plebeian public, the power of elite cultural production was irreducible to the semantic content of any work or inscription; rather, the power of this work was generated by the non-semantic, material fact of its existence. For a certain class of people, then, the experience of symbolic cultural power may simply have been graphic.

In attending to these concomitant political, cultural, and even religious vectors in the ninth- and tenth-century western Deccan, one trend stands out. At multiple sites within these nested scales of political authority, the Jain genre of the Ādipurāṇa was produced and reproduced in different languages and literary styles. Following Deven Patel, I call this the Ādipurāṇa tradition. Patel defines a literary tradition as “sets of textual and scholarly practices that grow up around a root or source text (mūla-grantha in Sanskrit). Tradition, thus, explains an ongoing set of self-aware text-critical and aesthetic engagements with a powerful literary object that span centuries.” The concept of a literary tradition enables us to think about the literary, social, and political connections

133 References to Jain texts—including Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa and the Dhavaḷā and Jayadhavaḷā manuscripts held at the Müdbidrī maṭha—as objects to be worshipped rather than read permeate premodern and early modern Deccani archives. Similarly, the placement of inscriptions often high up and out of sight—as with many Āśokan inscriptions—indicates that their intended purpose was unrelated to legibility or readability.
that constitute it, including the relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada Jain poetry, monastic versus lay texts, literary genealogies, and vectors of transmission and circulation. In turning to the Ādipurāṇa tradition, I am less concerned in this chapter with the mediating work of these texts—the focus of the remainder of the dissertation—but with their authors: the Rāṣṭrakūṭa poet Jinasēna, the Eastern Cāḷukya poet Pampa, and the Western Gaṅga poet Cāvuṇḍarāya and the role of the author function that they inhabit.

To be clear, empirically verifiable facts surrounding a group of authors from the ninth and tenth century are difficult to come by. Rather, I approach Jinasēna, Pampa, and Cāvuṇḍarāya as figures mediated by religious institutions, neatly narrativized literary and religious histories, and ideologically saturated forms of discourse found in inscriptions, the authors’ own self-fashioning, and their individual and over-lapping reception histories. All three of these authors are remembered as fulfilling particular roles and relationships within the institutionalized worlds they inhabited; their texts and the reception of their texts reflect these different investments. However, it is also clear that these authors negotiated and accumulated power vis-à-vis the court in ways that affected and shaped the transmission and circulation of their texts. By tracking these authors through various spheres of cultural production, we can trouble historical assumptions about political cohesion as militarily based and instead begin to unfold a world of cultural attachments, connections, and relationships that equally constituted political stability.

2. The Most Important Empire that No One Has Ever Heard Of

The heading of this section is something of a hyperbolic statement. The classification of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as an empire does appear, in a limited fashion, in
scholarship—most notably in the work on Ronald Inden.\(^1\) However, scholarship on Indian history, often with a nationalist tinge, has typically focused on the Mauryas, Guptas, Cōlas, Bādami Cāḷukyas, Vijayanagara, and Mughals as the paradigmatic empires of the subcontinent. Indeed, histories of empire have been deeply bound to the Indian nationalist project; A.S. Altekar and R.C. Majumdar’s *The Vakataka-Gupta Age Circa 200-550 a.d.*, for instance, envisioned the Gupta dominions spread over the entire expanse of the contemporary India state. Here empire translates to territorially driven expansion as orchestrated from a centralized state. However, while inscriptions, numismatics, and other historical evidence do attest to some sort of center of power, beyond this there seems to have been little more than a regional feudal state. The historian Romila Thapar has challenged the notion of a highly centralized state advocated by nationalist historians by proposing the notion of empire as a complex form made up of a metropolitan state (e.g. Magadha), core areas, and peripheral areas that included “differentiated political and economic systems.”\(^2\) Her dynamic vision of empire also incorporates change through which subregional areas became metropolitan states when the metropolitan state declined. The mechanics of Thapar’s notion of empire neatly line up with Burton Stein’s segmentary state model of premodern political organization in which the state is constructed as a center and periphery reduplicated in a beehive structure of identically organized units of varying sizes, which at every scale contain both a center and periphery. Symbolic power and ritual exchange were strongest at the imperial center that held together the segments of the state, but was weak in real power.

\(^1\) See for example Ronald Inden, “Reconstructions” in *Imagining India* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 213-262.

Rather, Stein argues that real power adhered at the level of the region, or the nādu, in the hands of regional leaders called nattar. In many ways, both Thapar and Stein’s understanding of the politics of power in premodern South Asia hinged upon the relationships that polities maintained with other smaller-scale and regional politics. Neither Thapar nor Stein fully unpacks the ways in which relationships between the center and the periphery were made, remade, and sustained.

Like previous imperial formations, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas began as a feudatory, in their case of the Bādami Cāḷukyas. Dantidurga (r. 735-756 C.E.), the first independent Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler, began his ascent through a series of targeted regional attacks in Kośala, Bharoch, and Gujarat. His territorial consolidation was supported by an alliance with Nandivarman II (r. 730-796 C.E.), the Pallava ruler and enemy of the Bādami Cāḷukya king Kīrtivarman II (r. 746-753 C.E.). Dantidurga inflicted significant damage upon Kīrtivarman II, whose overthrow was completed by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I (r. 756-774 C.E.), Dantidurga’s uncle and successor. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas immediately set about to consolidate their power at home in the Deccan. This meant bringing the Western Gaṅga and Eastern Cāḷukya dynasties to heel. Kṛṣṇa I first attacked and defeated the Gaṅgas in their stronghold of Gaṅgavāḍi. Kṛṣṇa I’s issuance of the Talegoan plates from Maṇṇe, the Gaṅga capital, attests to his control of the region. Next, Kṛṣṇa I dispatched his crown prince (yūvarāja) Gōvinda east to Veṅgi where he defeated the Eastern Cāḷukya king Viṣṇuvardhana IV (719-755 C.E.). The Gaṅgas and the Eastern Cāḷukyas joined other regional powers including the Śilāharas of the Konkan as key Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatories.

\[138\] Ibid., 44.
However, such relationships were not always simple given that feudatories—including the Rāṣṭrakūṭas themselves—exploited any perceived weakness at the center to destabilize and ultimately overthrow the imperial power. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas had to be militant in policing their vassals. For example, Dhruva (r. 780–793 C.E), Kṛṣṇa I’s second son to take power after Gōvinda II (r. 774–780 C.E), stamped down a Gaṅga rebellion by imprisoning their king Śivamāra and placing control of the region in his son Stambha’s hands.139 Similarly, after Dhruva, Gōvinda III (793–814 C.E) was required to reconquer his contemporary Eastern Cāḷukya ruler Vijayāditya. Such maintenance and constant consolidation and reconsolidation at the level of their local regional base allowed the Rāṣṭrakūṭas to mount a serious territorial expansion into north India in Bengal and south to Kāñci and the Pallava domains. By the period of Dhruva’s reign, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas controlled the vast majority of the subcontinent stretching from South India up to Kannauj (Fig. 2.1), but as much as the Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers aspired to look out to regions beyond the Deccan, they always trained one eye on home. The facilitation of a smooth political transition was key to the longevity of South Asian polities, a fact of which Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III was clearly aware. He died when his son Amōghavarṣa was a mere six years old. Yet Gōvinda III seemed to have planned for such a possibly by leaving his relation Karka Suvaraṇavarṣa from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gujarat branch in place as regent. Karka facilitated the child Amōghavarṣa’s rule and quelled the inevitable rebellion that his youthful ascension to the throne brought about: the Western Gaṅgas asserted their independence almost immediately and Eastern

139 Ibid., 54.
Cāḷukya ruler Vijayāditya II (808-847 C.E.) helped overthrow the boy ruler.\textsuperscript{140} With friends like these who needed enemies? However, the teenage Amōghavarṣa took back control of the situation; as expressed in the Karda plates, he became a “fire of destruction to the Chālukyas.”\textsuperscript{141} With Veṅgi brought back into line, Vijayāditya II became a close vassal of Amōghavarṣa and was given the title ankkāra or sworn warrior on behalf of an overlord.\textsuperscript{142} Elevated to this new position, Vijayāditya was mobilized to fight the Noḷambas, themselves a nested feudatory of the Western Gaṅgas, who were fighting alongside the Gaṅgas against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. When the Noḷambas and the Gaṅgas were subdued, Amōghavarṣa further stabilized the situation through the marriage of his daughter to the Western Gaṅga crown prince Bhūtuga.\textsuperscript{143}

The literary and religious efflorescence of Amōghavarṣa court explored in the previous chapter was not matched by the same degree of political success and stability. His rule was defined by a series of internal uprisings, most notably at first during his childhood, but also later when the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas rebelled in the 830s. A.N. Altekar observes, “What with these internal revolts and what with his naturally spiritual temperament, Amoghavarsha had neither the time or the inclination to take energetic part in the politics of northern India.”\textsuperscript{144} Yet, the claim of political quietism only holds up if we understand military engagement as the exclusive form of political maintenance of this period. Amōghavarṣa’s reign suggests instead an investment in the

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., 74-74; N. Ramesan, \textit{The Eastern Chalukyas of Vengi} (Hyderabad: Andhra Pradesh Sahithya Akademi, 1975), 19.
\textsuperscript{141} Altekar, \textit{The Rashtrakūṭas}, 75.
\textsuperscript{143} Altekar, \textit{The Rashtrakūṭas and Their Times}, 79.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 77.
ideological and cultural reproduction of imperium, one that would ultimately prove more enduring than any territorial gains. The two interrelated phenomena that defined his court—the rise of Jain literati and the emergence of Kannada as a literary language—flowed like blood, filling the arteries and veins of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire. Moving across a variety of elite roles beyond simply author, Jains penetrated beyond the Rāṣṭrakūṭa center into the worlds of the its feudatories, most notably the Gaṅgas and the Eastern Cāḷukyas. As these Jains and their texts traveled, they carried with them tastes and sensibilities related to genre, language, and style that would come to define the literary culture of the entire medieval period of the Deccan. A vision of the political was also part of this package; Jains produced the texts that underpinned symbolic power, but they also expressed a vision of power and ideal political worlds that were themselves distinctly Jain. When viewed from the historical perspective of alliances, insurrections, and military engagements, the tumultuous relationship between the Rāṣṭrakūṭa center and its peripheries appears fragile and precarious. I now want to turn to a different sort of history, one of cultural and religious engagement and connection traced through the lives of Jain poets and their works.

3. Jinasēna the Poet, Jinasēna the Institution

This alternative history begins with the Jain monk Jinasēna, the preeminent poet of Amōghavarṣa’s court. However, the biographical fragments we possess of Jinasēna’s life tell us very little about his specific relationship to and status within this court. As is so often the case with medieval texts, we learn very little about the author Jinasēna from his three works: the Jayadhavaḷā (837 C.E.), the Pārśvābhyudaya (c. 840 C.E.), and the
Ādipurāṇa (c. 860 C.E.). The thirty-six verses of Jinasēna's Jayadhavāḷā colophon comprise the only available piece of his autobiographical writing and, even then, the scope of what we learn is quite circumscribed. He states that he began as a pupil of the monks Candrasēna and Āryanandi and, eventually, comes under the tutelage of Vīrasēna. Together he and Vīrasēna complete the Jayadhavāḷā commentary on the Kaśāyaprābhṛta during the reign of Amōghavarsa at a place called Vātagramapura.

---

145 I diverge from M.G. Kothari's opinion that Jinasēna wrote the Ādipurāṇa first. It is clear from Guṇabhadrā's take over of their joint Mahāpurāṇa project that Jinasēna died while writing the Ādipurāṇa, making it certain that the Pārśvābhhyudaya was his first literary endeavor. M.G. Kothari, trans. Śrījinasenācaryaviracitam Pārśvābhhyudayam (Mumbai: Kamstraksan House, 1965), Introduction 17.

146 M.D. Vasantaraj says that there are thirty-six verses in Jinasēna’s colophon to the Jayadhavāḷā. Vasantaraj, Jaināgama Itihāsa Dīpika (Mysore: V.R. Prakashana, 1997), 279. I have found a number of secondary sources that cite directly from these verses. For example, see Pushpa Gupta, Rasa in the Jaina Sanskrit Mahākāvyas (Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1993), 16-17, fns. 2 and 5; Kothari, Śrījinasenācaryaviracitam Pārśvābhhyudayam, 22; K. B Pathak, “Bhartṛihari and Kumārika,” Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. 18 (1890-1894), 226; and Nathurama Premi, Jaina Sahitya aur Itihāsa (Bombay: Hindi-Grantha-Ratnakara, 1956), 129, fns. 4 and 5. However, I have been unable to locate these verses in any published editions of the text nor have I been given access to the manuscripts themselves. The current editor of the Dhavāḷā and Jayadhavāḷā at Dhavāḷā Tirtha Institute at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa told me that while previous published editions selectively quote from the colophon verses in their introductions, they mistakenly did not print the complete text of the colophon at the end of the volumes. The citations in the secondary sources likely come from unpublished transcriptions such as the one that A.N. Upadhye copied from the Śolapur manuscript. Upadhye, “Bṛhat-Kathākośa,” Upādhye Papers (Mysore: Prasaranga, University of Mysore, 1983), 104 fn. 8. From various sources I have been able to reconstruct thirty out of the thirty-six verses that Vasantaraj mentions.

147 JD, v. 19 and 26.

148 Ibid., v. 6. Jinasēna is often referred to in secondary literature as a brāhmaṇical convert to Jainism, contradicting his own account of entering the monkhood as a child. Ralph Strohl summarizes this tension as “One tradition considers him to have been a Brahman convert, although another tradition considers him to have taken Jaina orders at a very young age.” Ralph Strohl, “Making One’s Bed and Lying in it: Uses of Rasa and Bhāva in the Ādipurāṇa of Jinasena,” in Vasantagauravam Essays in Jainism: Felicitating Professor M.D. Vasantharaj of Mysore on the Occasion of his Seventy-fifth Birthday, ed. Jayandra Soni (Mumbai: Vakils, Feffer and Simons, 2001), 143; and George Ralph Strohl, “The Image of the Hero in Jainism: Rṣabha, Bharata, and Bāhubali in the
then describes himself in the following manner:

Previously unpricked, his two ears were pierced with the quill of knowledge. Longing for the Lakṣmi of liberation, he possessed the quality of being a bhavya.149 He followed an unbroken vow of celibacy from childhood. That muni did not posses a particularly beautiful body nor was he extremely clever. Even so, the Goddess Sarasvati, the embodiment of heightened pleasure and the abode of no man, selected him herself with a garland during in a self-choice ceremony. His innate qualities were radiance, calmness, discipline, and he was unaffected by qualities that effected other learned men. With regards to his body, he was very small, but with regards to his ascetic qualities, he was not small at all. His body was emaciated, but he was not emaciated in terms of virtue. He did not overextend his sphere of influence nor did he think too swiftly. Therefore, he turned towards the distant shore of the lake of his own knowledge. He spent his time is perpetual worship of knowledge. After that, those possessing correct sight considered him to have a body filled with wisdom.150

Ādipurāṇa of Jinasēna” (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 1984), 14. However, this seems to be a slight mischaracterization of the situation. There is no premodern source that I am aware of that names Jinasēna as a brahman. Instead, the basis for this attribution is largely based on the brāhmaṇically inflected practices that he advocates in the Ādipurāṇa that appear counter to the critiques of such practices found elsewhere in the Jain tradition. For a good summary of Jinasēna’s relationship to brāhmaṇical practice see “Jaina Integration of the Hindu Saṃskāras” in P.S. Jaini, The Jaina Path of Purification (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 291. For a more general account of the relationship between Digambara Jainism and Hindu saṃskāras see Paul Dundas, “A Digambara Jain Saṃskāra in the Early Seventeenth Century: Lay Funerary Ritual According to Somasenabhaṭṭāraka’s Traivārṇikācāra,” Indo-Iranian Journal 54 (2011): 99-147.

149 Bhavya is a technical term that describes a soul with liberatory potential. It regularly appears within Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa. I return to his usage of the term later in this chapter.

150

| tasya śiṣyo abhavac chrīmāṇjinasenaḥ samiddhidiḥ | aviddhāvapi yatkārṇau viddhau jñānaśalākayā || 27 |
| yasminnāsannabhavyatvānṃuktilākṣmīḥ samutsukā | svayaṃ varīṭukāmeva śravī mālāmayūyujat || 28 |
| yono anucaritaṃ bāłyādbrahmavratamakhaṇḍitatam | svayaṃvarīvīhānena citramūḍā sarasvatī || 29 |
| yo nā atisundarākāro na caṭicaturo muniḥ | tathā apyananyaśaraṇā yaṃ sarasvatyupācarat || 30 |
| śrī śamo vinayāṣceti yasya naisargikā guṇāḥ | sūrīnārādhayanti sma, guṇair ārādhyate na kaḥ || 31 |
Jinasēna first establishes himself as a child monk, represented in the text through ear piercing, a ritual performed on young boys. In Jinasēna’s case, the instrument for piercing is the sharp quill of knowledge that symbolizes his entry into monastic training. His early entry into monasticism is emphasized here again through his practice of celibacy from childhood. Through this ascetic focus, Jinasēna writes against the grain of the conceits of court poetry: he is not beautiful or smart, his body is emaciated, and his temperament is perhaps best characterized by restraint (note Jinasēna’s poetics of modesty in contrast to Pampa’s self-aggrandizing style in the next section). Yet, all of these seemingly disadvantageous qualities are turned into virtues that attest to his ascetic mastery and intellectual prowess. Even the standard trope of the bride’s self-choice ceremony is inverted: Saravati, the goddess of knowledge, chooses him in spite of his perceived intellectual and physical limitations. We can presume that it is through the grace of Sarasvati that Jinasēna’s body becomes a vessel of knowledge. Beyond this ascetic self-elaboration, Jinasēna provides no further information about his caste, family background, or natal place (note again the stark contrast to the lay Jain Pampa’s familial genealogy in the next section). This makes sense given that Jinasēna inhabits the renunciatory subjectivity of a monk in which all ties to the world are abandoned other than those to the monastic community itself. Jinasēna appears here exclusively through the somewhat

\[
\text{yaḥ kṛśo api śarīreṇa na kṛśo abhūtapoguṇaiḥ |}
\text{na kṛśatvaḥ hi śārīraṁ guṇaireva kṛśaḥ kṛśaḥ || 32}
\text{yo nā agrahītkapilikā nā apyacintayadañjasā |}
\text{tathā apyadhyaṁvidyābdheḥ paraṁ pāramāsiśriyat || 33}
\text{jñānārādhanayā yasya gataḥ kālo nirantaram |}
\text{tato jñānamayam piṇḍaṁ yamāhustattvadarśanaḥ || JD, 34 via M.G. Kothari, trans.}
\text{Śrījinasenācaryaviracitam Pārśvābhuyadayam (Mumbai: Kamstraksan House, 1965), introduction, 22.}
\]
anonymous figure of the monk. He is equally evasive in the Pārśvābhuyadaya, his first poetic composition that narrates the life of the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara Pārśvanātha while incorporating the entirety of Kālidāsa’s Meghadūta. He ends the Pārśvābhuyadaya simply with two lines in praise of Kālidāsa's Meghadūta, King Amoghavarṣa, a fellow monk named Vinayasēna, and his preceptor Vīrasēna.\textsuperscript{151}

The Ādipurāṇa too provides no specific information about the circumstances of Jinasēna’s life. However, the opening of the text importantly situates the reader in Jinasēna’s literary and monastic world. In standard Jain textual fashion, Jinasēna begins the Ādipurāṇa in praise of the Jinas, the Arhats, the Gaṇadharas, and the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition. He then metapoetically defines the genres of the purāṇa and mahāpurāṇa and gestures to the excellent poets who wrote before him. He deems these poets crucial to his own literary endeavor. He says,

\begin{quote}
Although it was narrated by the Gaṇadharas,
I will make an effort to compose this purāṇa.
Who can prevent an ordinary animal going on a route taken by lions?
I travel on the narrative path trodden by ancient poets.
Even ordinary people go via the path invented by great people.\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}

These verses inhabit a poetics of modesty in which Jinasēna is made ordinary and earlier poets are made great. He goes on to name these poets and their poetic and intellectual virtues including Siddhasēna, Sāmantabhadra, Śrīdatta, Yaśōbhadra, Prabhācandra, Śivakōti, Jaṭasimhanandi/Jaṭācārya, Kāṇabhikṣu, Devācārya, Dēvanandi, Bhaṭṭākaṇka, 151 PA, vv. 4.69-70.
\textsuperscript{152} ganādhīśaiḥ praṇīte api purāṇe asminn aham yate |
 simhāir āśevite mārgē mṛgo anyāḥ kena vāryate || 1.30
purāṇakaviḥīḥ kṣun̄e kathāmārgē asti me gatiḥ |
paurastyaivīḥ śodhitaṁ mārgaṁ ko vā nānvrajej janaṁ || JĀP, 1.31
Śrīpañā, Pātrēkṣari, Vādisiṁha, and finally, his guru, Vīrasēna. What is notable about Jinasēna’s assemblage of poets—some still well known and others now forgotten—is that they are all monks. Indeed, up until the Kannada poet Pamba, all Deccani Jain Digambara literature was the product of a vibrant monastic community. Moreover, these monks like Jaṭasimhanandi who wrote the Varāṅgacarita, composed poetry and were often, but not always, affiliated with the courts of the Deccan. Indeed, in Jinasēna’s view, the writing of poetry in Sanskrit and Prakrit appears as a central activity for Jain monastics. Jinasēna positions himself within and indebted to this coterie of great monastic poets who came before him.

More broadly, participation in lineages—sectarian, monastic, literary or otherwise—were important ways in which medieval Jain monastic poets and authors sought to orient their texts and claim legitimacy for their work. Shared lines of religious and literary descent served to place oneself and one's text in a historical continuum stretching back to the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra—a historical figure who was a contemporary of the Buddha—and the learned community of ascetics that preserved his teachings. Jinasēna too became incorporated into such lineages. Writing in Kannada from the tenth to thirteenth centuries and beyond, Jain authors viewed Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa as

---

153 The collapse of poetic and monastic identities can be confusing especially in reference to figures such as Sāmantabhadra, a monk claimed by nearly every monastic lineage and who is far better known for his technical religious treatises such as the Ratnakaranda Śravakācāra, a manual on lay Jain conduct, and the Gandhahastimahābhāṣya, a commentary on Umāsvāti’s Tattvārtasūtra. From the extant sources, we simply do not know Sāmantabhadra as a poet in Sanskrit or otherwise. B.L Rice cites an inscription that states that Sāmantabhadra wrote in “bhāṣa,” which he interprets to likely mean Kannada. B.L. Rice, “Early History of Kannada Literature,” JBBRAS 12 (1890): 250. Perhaps with access to Sāmantabhadra’s other writing, Jinasēna specifically says, “The fame of Sāmantabhadra is the crown jewel on the heads of poets, bards, disputants, and orators.” JĀP, v. 144. It seems that in Jinasēna’s eyes even Sāmantabhadra was a poet, not just a monk engaged in philosophical disputation.
a literary milestone not simply in Sanskrit literary history, but also in a broader Jain Deccani literary milieu that spanned Sanskrit and Kannada. The poet Pampa traces the tradition of writing the narrative of the first Tīrthaṅkara to Jinasēna in his Kannada rendering of the Ādipurāṇaṃ (941 C.E.); Cāvuṇḍarāya remembers Jinasēna as one who wrote a mahāpurāṇa in his own Kannada version of the text called the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣapurāṇaṃ (978 C.E.); and Janna mentions Jinasēna's text as inspiration in his Kannada Anantanāthapurāṇaṃ (1230 C.E.). The relationship between Jinasēna and later Kannada court poets fleetingly gestured to here is most powerfully articulated by Hastimalla's Pūrvapurāṇam (late 13th C.E.). Hastimalla summarizes Jinasēna's version of the Ādipurāṇa in Kannada and places a single Sanskrit verse drawn from Jinasēna at the head of each of his chapters. At the end of the text, Hastimalla describes himself as “imperial poet of both languages” (ubhayabhāṣakavicakravarti), a title through which he laid claim to both Sanskrit and Kannada. Such titles touting one's poetic ability in both languages were not uncommon in this period: bilingualism was a skill worthy of praise. Rather than presenting vernacular literature as a radical


155 Warder notes that Hastimalla must have lived earlier than 1318 C.E. because Ayyapārya's Jinendrakalyāṇābhuyudaya bears a line in his praise. A.K. Warder, Indian Kāvya Literature (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992), 829.

156 S.P. Patil, ed. Hastimallaviracitaṃ Pūrvapurāṇam (Dharward: Karnataka Univeristy Press, 1982), final unnumbered verse, 53. Besides Kannada, we know that Hastimalla did, indeed, write in Sanskrit. He is the first extant Digambara Sanskrit dramaturg. He seems particularly interested in the stories that derive from the Ādipurāṇa such as the romance between Ādinātha’s eldest son Bharata and his wife Subhadrā as told in Hastimalla’s Subhadrānāṭikā. See M.V. Patwardhan, The Añjanāpavanamjaya and Subhadrānāṭikā of Hastimalla: Edited for the First Time with Variant Readings and an Exhaustive Introduction Dealing with Hastimalla’s Life and Writings (Bombay: Manikachandra D. Jaina Granthamala, 1950).
break from the Sanskritic tradition, Jain Kannada throughout the Deccan poets saw themselves as working within a literary tradition inaugurated with Jinasēna's Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa.

In the Kannada, Prakrit, and Sanskrit literary-historical materials produced in the centuries after his death, Jinasēna was remembered less as a court poet and more as "an institution than an individual."157 In the guise of a poet-author, prominent monk, community stabilizer, and lineage head, Jinasēna was mobilized to manage several orders of incoherence, instability and lack in the Jain community. In the centuries that preceded the Common Era, the Jain community as a whole lost the vast majority of their scriptural canon, a set of fourteen texts called the Pūrvas.158 This loss engendered a state of scriptural crisis within the Digambara and the Śvētāmbara Jain sects. The Digambara tradition claimed to have orally retained a small portion of the Drṣṭivāda (a later textual distillation of the fourteen Pūrvas) related to karma theory. This scriptural fragment was committed to writing in the second century as the Saṭkhaṇḍāgama (The Scripture in Six Parts) and the Kaṣāyaprābhṛta (The Chapter on the Passions; Prk. Kasāyapāhuḍaṃ).159 Together these two texts form the core of what is called the Digambara "secondary

158 The monk Bhadrabāhu, who is attributed to bringing Jainism to the Mysore region, as described in the introduction to this dissertation, is the last person who both the Digambara and Śvētāmbara's agree had knowledge of the entire scriptural corpus. P.S. Jaini, The Jaina Path of Purification (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 50.
canon.”\textsuperscript{160} Written in Jain Sauraseni gāthas, the Šatkhāṇḍāgama and the Kaśāyaprābhṛta are largely impenetrable without the extant Sanskrit-Prakrit hybrid commentaries produced in the ninth-century Deccan.\textsuperscript{161} The monk Vīrasēna, Jinasēna's preceptor, composed the Dhavalā commentary on the Šatkhāṇḍāgama during the reign of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Gōvinda III (r. 793-814 C.E.), Amōghavarsa's father.\textsuperscript{162} After its completion, Vīrasēna turned his energies to a similar commentarial project on the

\textsuperscript{160} These texts are published in Kannada script from the National Institute of Prakrit Studies and Research at Sravana Belgoḷa and are not currently owned by any North American library. The Dhavalā is published in sixteen volumes and the Jayadhaḷavālī in another sixteen volumes. In addition, the sixth part of the Šatkhāṇḍāgama circulates and is published separately as the Mahādhavalā. It is worth noting that the Mahādhavalā section of the text was not commented upon by Vīrasēna or Jinasēna. The original palm leaf illuminated manuscripts of these texts are held at the Jain matha at Mūḍbidrī. A paper manuscript copy of the Dhavalā and Jayadhaḷavālī is also held at the Jain manuscript library in Arrah, Orissa. For the fascinating narrative of how these texts were rediscovered and published see “Scripture as Sacred Object: The Manuscripts at Mūḍbidrī,” in Paul Dunas, The Jains, (London: Routledge, 2002), 64-65 and “An Extra Copy Prepared by Pt. Gajapati Shāstry” et al. in Acharya Shri Nagrajji, Āgama Auras Tripiṭaka: A Comparative Study of Lord Mahavira and Lord Buddha, Vol. 2: Language and Literature (Delhi: Concept Publishing, 2003), 510-516.

\textsuperscript{161} In his Srutāvatārā, Indranandi states that there were six commentaries produced on the Dhavalā by Kundakunda, Samakunda, Tumbulura, Sāmāntabhadrā, Bappadēva, and Vīrasēna respectively. Hiralal Jain, ed. The Šatkhāṇḍāgama of Puspadanta and Bhūtabali with the Commentary Dhavalā of Virasena (Amravati: Shrimant Seth Laxmichandra Shitabrai, 1939), ii and Phool Chandra Siddhant Shastri, Mahendra Kumar Nyayacharya, and Kailash Chandra Siddhant Shastri, eds, Kasāya-Pāhuḍam by Gunadharāchārya with the Churni Sutra of Yativrashabhāchārya and the Commentary Jayadhavalā of Veersenachārya Upon Both, Vol. 1 (Chaurasi: All-India Digambar Jain Sangha, 1944), 2.

\textsuperscript{162} In the colophon of the Dhavalā, Vīrasēna describes himself as a student of Elācārya (Elāriya, v. 1.1) and part of the Paṇḍastupa (Paṇcatthhuva, v. 1.4) lineage of Candrasēna (Caṇḍaseṇa, v. 1.4) and Āryanandi (Ajjanādi, v. 1.4) and dates the text to the reign of Jagatūṅgadeva (v. 7). The astrological details found within the colophon do not generate a viable date for the completion of the text, however, Jagatūṅgadeva is an epithet of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Gōvinda III (r. 793-814 C.E.) so the text has been dated to his reign. The published editions of the Dhavalā numerically restart the pagination for each section of the text. Vīrasēna and Jinasēna's colophon is located in the last volume of the Šatkhāṇḍāgama after the final page of the Appābahuānuyogaddāre Uttarapayadisatakammadado (Jain, The Šatkhāṇḍāgama, 513) and is the first page of the section called the Pustakapradāṭtrpraśa (Ibid, 1).
Kaśāya-prabhṛta called the Jayadhavāḷa. Part way through writing this commentary, Vīrasēna died and Jinasēna continued the Jayadhavāḷa to its completion in 837 c.e.\(^{163}\)

Like Vīrasēna before him, Jinasēna died in the middle of writing what would come to be considered his magnum opus, the Ādipurāṇa, the first Jain epic-length poetic rendering of the biography of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha in Sanskrit.\(^{164}\) The text’s novelty lies not only its choice of language, but also in its generic commitments. As we will see in chapter three, Jinasēna understood his text to contain within it many different genres. Among them, he most pointedly emphasized the Ādipurāṇa as mahākāvya or epic court poetry. With this text, we have a monk writing in an explicitly courtly style.

Jinasēna composed the initial 9,238 verses arranged in forty-two chapters and Guṇabhadra, his pupil, completed the final 1,701 verses that comprise the remaining six chapters of the text. Very early in the Ādipurāṇa, Jinasēna states his intent "to assemble a purāṇa related to the sixty-three men," a genre of universal history called the Mahāpurāṇa that narrates the stories of the great men of the Jain tradition in which the Ādipurāṇa is the first chapter.\(^{165}\) To fulfill his preceptor's original literary intention,

\(^{163}\) Shastri, Kasāya-Pāhudam, 1. Devasēna's Darśanasāra states that Vīrasēna composed the first 20,000 verses and Jinasēna finished the remaining 60,000 verses.

\(^{164}\) Paul Dundas translates the title “Ādipurāṇa” as "Lorebook of the Beginning." Dundas, The Jains, 119.

\(^{165}\) JĀP, v. 1.19. The breakdown of the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition (triṃsaṭiśalākāpurusa), as found in the genre of the mahāpurāṇa, is as follows: twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras, the embodiment of Jain dharma, who spread Jain teachings in the world before they are liberated as Arhats; twelve Cakravartins, universal rulers who achieve liberation as Siddhas; nine Vāsudēvas, half-cakravartin heroes who are reborn in hell for killing their enemies, but ultimately are liberated in their future lives; nine Baladēvas, brothers of the Vāsadēvas and virtuous kings who rule in the world; and nine Prativāsudēvas, evil kings who are reborn in hell and are the enemies of the Vāsadēvas. Whitney Kelting, Singing to the Jinas: Jain Laywomen, Maṇḍal Singing, and the Negotiations of Devotion (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 193. The Tīrthaṅkaras are the central moral exemplars of this structure and the other three categories of beings
Guṇabhadra wrote sixty-two additional purāṇas that, together with Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa, make up a complete Mahāpurāṇa. The sections composed by Jinasēna and Guṇabhadra circulated and continue to circulate together as a single Mahāpurāṇa and separately as the Ādipurāṇa, which is also called the Pūrvapurāṇa (the Earlier Purāṇa), and as the Uttarapurāṇa (the Concluding Purāṇa). Guṇabhadra states that he completed his sections of the Mahāpurāṇa in 897 C.E. during the reign of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa II (878–914 C.E.), likely putting Jinasēna's death anywhere between 850–875 C.E. Given that praise to oneself and to one's patron typically occurred in colophons at the end of the poem, we are left to guess how Jinasēna would have represented himself had he lived to complete the text. Instead, we see Jinasēna through the Guṇabhadra's eyes in the colophon at the end of his Uttarapurāṇa.

Guṇabhadra praises Jinasēna as an authority on grammar and hermeneutics (mīmāmsā), an expert in refuting opposing views, and a skillful storyteller. Beyond routinized forms of praise, Guṇabhadra locates Jinasēna within a specific monastic line of descent. He says:

The muni Jinasēna follows from Vīrasēna
like the sun shining from the slopes of the eastern mountain.
He is an entire śāstra produced from perfect knowledge
like the sound produced from the flooding Gaṅga in the Himalayas.  

are sometimes conflated into a triad linked to each Jina. The only irregularity to this rigid structure is that the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth Tīrthaṅkaras—Sāntinātha, Kunthunātha, and Aranātha—who appear simultaneously as both Tīrthaṅkaras and Cakravartins.


abhavadiva himādrērdēvasindhupravāhō dhvaniriva sakalajñātsarvaśāstraikamūrtiḥ
udayagiritaṭādvā bhāskarō bhāsamānō muniranu jinasēnō vīrasēnādamuṣmāt || GĀP, colophon 8 {mālinī}
Here, Guṇabhadra layers simile upon simile (mālōpamā) to reinforce the relationship between Jinasēna and his preceptor Vīrasēna, a relationship expressed in this verse through the nominative and ablative cases. Vīrasēna is the source—the eastern mountain, perfect knowledge, the Gaṅga in spate—from which arises Jinasēna—the shining sun, an entire śāstra, the whooshing of a flood. Then Guṇabhadra tells us that he "famous in all the world, was a student of them both."

Connected through this student-teacher relationship of shared literary endeavors and line of monastic descent, Guṇabhadra poetically binds himself to Vīrasēna and Jinasēna in a monastic triad.

From the concluding colophons of the Dhavaḷā and Jayadhavaḷā commentaries, Vīrasēna and Jinasēna make clear their monastic affiliation with the Pañcastūpā Anvaya, a branch of the largest Digambara monastic community called the Mūla Saṅgha (the Root Community). In tracing his line of descent, Guṇabhadra does not name the Pañcastūpa per se, but instead praises the Sēna Anvaya (the Army Lineage). Prior to this instance, there is no historical record of a Jain community called the Sēna and the name only next appears in the Mulgunda inscription of 1053 C.E. Following Guṇabhadra's colophon, these two names were used to designate the same community, with the name Sēna eventually coming to supersede Pañcastūpa in common usage. While the exact

168 Ibid., v.14.
170 GĀP, v. 2.
circumstances that precipitated this name change are unclear, the appearance of the Sēna Anvaya—a designation that echoes the final element in Vīrasēna and Jinasēna's compounded names—is an unlikely coincidence.\textsuperscript{173} Through the new appellation of the Sēna, Guṇabhadra signals the centrality of Vīrasēna and Jinasēna within what was formerly the Pañcastūpa lineage.\textsuperscript{174} More broadly, this form of eulogization aligns with Guṇabhadra's attempts to elevate Vīrasēna and Jinasēna and, by extension, to situate himself as the heir of these two important Digambara ascetic intellectuals and poets.

The seeming fluidity of monastic community names reflected by the shift from the Pañcastūpa to the Sēna Anvaya reflects the changing and increasingly contested quality of the monastic landscape during Jinasēna's time. Due to the fragmentation of the Mūla Saṅgha, likely the original Digambara monastic community, and subsequent expansion of the Digambara monastic orders, R.N. Nandi refers to the eighth to tenth centuries as "the most eventful in the history of the Jaina Church."\textsuperscript{175} A diverse set of forces were at work during this period, including doctrinal differences around food, gender, the practice of itinerancy, contested control over leadership positions, and what appears to be multiple waves of monastic migration to the Deccan from other parts of South Asia.\textsuperscript{176} The later was the case with the Pañcastūpa Anvaya that spread from

\textsuperscript{173} Names were important identifiers of monastic affiliation. For example, after Vīrasēna and Jinasēna monks of the Pañcastūpa/Sēna Anvaya often bore names ending either in either "sēna" or in "bhadra."


\textsuperscript{175} Nandi, Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan, 41-42.

\textsuperscript{176} The leadership trajectory of the Pañcastūpa/Sēna Anvaya is a good illustration of the problems that plagued monastic lineages in this period. Devasēna's Darśanasāra describes the seventh-century monk Kumarasēna's laxity of practice with regards to using a cow tail broom rather than a peacock broom. A.N. Upadhye, “Darśanasāra of Devasena: A Critical Text,” Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 15. 3/4
Mathura to parts of Bengal, Orissa, and the Kannada speaking regions of the Deccan.\textsuperscript{177} The disarray and fragmentation among the Digambara orders was addressed in contemporary writing from the period—including Guṇabhadra's Ātmānuśasana (c. 9\textsuperscript{th} century), Dēvasena's Darśanasāra (933 C.E), and Indranandi's Śrutāvatarakathā and his Nītisāra (c. mid-10\textsuperscript{th} century)—and was attested to in inscriptions that document an ever-proliferating number of monastic groups indiscriminately called anvayas, gacchas, gaṇas, and śākhās, saṅghas and so on.\textsuperscript{178}

There are two competing narratives traditions that profess to explain how the turmoil within the monastic community was resolved. The Śrutāvatārakathā by Indranandi, a member of the Draviḍa Saṅgha along with three supporting inscriptions state that the monk Arthabali stabilized the Mūla Saṅgha by creating the four divisions of the Nandi, Sēna, Siṁha, and Dēva communities.\textsuperscript{179} In addition, the Śrutāvatāra specifies (1933-34): 203-204, vv. 27 & v.35. In addition to, or perhaps because of, the problems with his monastic practice, it seems that Kumarasēna was passed over in favor of Jinasēna for the leadership of the Sēna Anvaya. In Devasena's version of events, Kumarasēna left or was thrown out of the Sēna Anvaya to found his own monastic lineage called the Kāṣṭhā Saṅgha. Nandi, Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan, 51-52; Singh, Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka, 127.

\textsuperscript{177} Nandi states that Pañcāstūpa Anvaya came from the Paharpur region in the Rajshahi district of Bangladesh. Nandi, Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan, 49. However it seems more likely that the name Pañcāstūpa refers specifically to the area around Mathura. Jyoti Prasad Jain, Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India: 100 BC-AD 900 (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 2005), 124.

\textsuperscript{178} Upadhye notes that Indranandi’s dates are unclear, but that he was certainly later than Jinasēna and perhaps even Guṇabhadra. Upadhye, “Pañcāstūpānvaya,” 282. On the second point, Upadhye says, “The Jaina monks often associate themselves with one of the other Saṅgha, Gaṇa, Gaccha, Anvaya, Saṁbhoga, Śākhā, Valaya etc. What these terms exactly meant, how these groups were mutually related, why particular names were given to them, etc., are matters which still await critical investigation.” Ibid., 279.

\textsuperscript{179} These inscriptions are found in EC Vol. 2, nos 54, 105, and 108; Indranandi traces the origins of the Draviḍa Saṅgha to the monk Vajranandi who founded the lineage in Madurai. Darśanasāra v. 24 via Nandi, Religious Institutions an Cults in the Deccan, 62. However, in his other work, the Jvālāmālinikalpa, Indranandi connects the Saṅgha back
that "Arthabalī gave the names Sēna, Deva, and Nandī to the monks who came from Pañcastūpa (Pañcasthupi), Aśokavana, and Jagurguhā." This version of events is described quite differently in the Darśanasāra of Dēvasēna, a monk from the Sēna Anvaya, who claims, "Jinasēna, the student of Holy Vīrasēna, possessing knowledge of all the sciences, coming after Holy Padmanandi, calmed the dissolution of the four saṅghas." Given the dating of these texts, these rival historical narratives were clearly composed as a post hoc rational for a fragmentation that had taken place much earlier. Composed nearly a hundred years after Jinasēna, the Śrutāvatāra and the Darśanasāra tell us more about the role of charismatic monks like Jinasēna within the persistent competition between monastic communities—in this case Indranandi's Draviḍa Saṅgha and Dēvasēna's Sēna Anvaya—than they do about the formulation of monastic organization. For followers of the Sēna Anvaya for whom the Darśanasāra would have been important, Jinasēna was not just a lauded poet or even a major Digambara thinker: he was an institutionally important figure central to the persistence of Digambara Jainism in the Deccan region.

---

180 Ibid., 50; This version of events is also supported by an inscription at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. EC Vol. 2, no. 105, 161-166 (English), 103-108 (Kannada), 75-80 (Transliteration). On the interpretation of this inscription see A. Guérinot, Répertoire d’épigraphie Jaina, Précédé d’une Esquisse de l’Histoire du Jainisme d’après les Inscriptions (Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1908), 222.


182 It is clear that the divisions within the monastic communities had very real material consequences. For example, the city of Kāraṇja, like others from this period, had multiple Jain temples belonging to different monastic branches. V.A. Sangave, Jaina Community (Popular Book Depot, 1980), 394. The parcelization of monastic activity into different groups also extended to the maṭhas, or monasteries, that began to pop up all over Karnataka in the medieval period. The Sēna maṭha is located at Nāndaṇī, outside of
The crystallization of Jinasēna's centrality within the Sēna Anvaya was formally inscribed in the Sēna's paṭṭāvalis, or the lists of pontifical succession. Despite their abridged version of historical descent, paṭṭāvalis were a vital method through which monastic communities maintained their lines of spiritual authority. Beyond this, as Paul Dundas notes, "the cataloging of the activities of various distinguished teachers and ascetics furnished a sense of community and achievement with which the monk could easily identify, and which elicited a feeling of loyalty from members of a monastic group." One such paṭṭāvali gives the descent of the Puṣkara Gaccha, a sub-group of the Sēna Anvaya, which was again a group within the larger community of the Mūla Saṅgha.

As expected, Jinasēna appears in a triad with Vīrasēna and Guṇabhadra:

In this lineage, it was Vīrasēna who commanded self-restraint. On the Raivata Mountain, in the middle of a place called Hemnāguṇpha, his mind meditated on the siddhacakra yantra. There in the lineage was Jinasēna, intent upon upliftment. Through the combination of pure words, he composed an ancient epic with extreme purity. His venerable friend was named Daśaratha and, in that lineage, his students were named Guṇabhadra and Lohasēnaka.

Kolhāpur, Maharashtra. The traditional name passed down to each bhaṭṭāraka (lineage head) is Jinasēna, in honor of the ninth-century poet intellectual.

183 These lines of descent are were passed down orally, carved in stone, and later recorded in writing. For example see Jinasēna in EC Vol. 2, no. 162 (English), 103-108 (Kannada), 76-80 (translit); and A.N.Upadhye, “A Paṭṭāvali of the Senagaṇa,” in Upadhye Papers (Mysore: Prasaranga, University of Mysore, 1983), 248, v. 21. For monastic communities, the line of descent from the originator of the lineage to the present is what authorizes spiritual authority.


185 tatpaṭṭhe viṛaseno yamadamasahito raivateparvate yo hemnāguṇphasya madhye yutimatisahitāḥ siddhacakraśrādiyantarām | āśīduddhārayukaṃ vimalapadayutaṃ cakrire tatra paṭṭe śrīmājjainadiseno vimalatarasaha paūrāṇakaṃ cakriyāḥ || 22 śrīmaddasāraṭṭhākhyāmsaṃ cæ̑sam vai guṛūbandhavaḥ taçciṣyā guṇabhadrākhyāṣṭatpaṭṭe lohasenakāḥ || 23 via Upadhye, “A Paṭṭāvali of the Senagaṇa,” 248.
Memorized, inscribed in stone, and circulated on palm-leaf manuscript, these chronological lists of names bear little more than scant highlights of each individual’s claim to fame. In the Sēnas’s paṭṭāvali Jinasēna is positioned as monk to whom other later monks traced their authority, but he is also remembered for what is possibly his most enduring contribution to Digambara Jainism: his composition of an ancient epic, namely, the Ādipurāṇa.

The information marshaled together here about Jinasēna remembers him as an institutionally important figure who composed one of the central Jain Digambara texts in the medieval period. As we will see, it is not all together clear that Jinasēna was writing for his fellow monks; rather, he imagined his Ādipurāṇa as a text to be read by kings and courts. However, in the turbulent period in which he lived, Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa was quickly (perhaps almost immediately) absorbed into the Digambara secondary canon formed in the absence of the original Pūrva scriptures, highlighting the blurriness between courtly and religious genres in this period. Despite its courtly pretense—again, he describes the text as mahākāvya or epic court poetry—Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa literally became scripture. Thus, like its author, the Ādipurāṇa too became institutionally significant in stabilizing the Digambara Jain scriptural canon. As Jinasēna and his Ādipurāṇa were absorbed into the religious spheres of lineage and scripture, his poetry still continued to serve as a model for court poets, most notably Pampa. Jinasēna’s lesser-known reception history within early Kannada poetry is briefly unfolded below.

4. Pampa: A Real Jewel of a Poet

At the same time that Jinasēna was writing poetry in or in affiliation with Amōghavarṣa’s court, Kannada emerged as a viable linguistic vehicle for similar literary
endeavors. The poet Pampa’s choice of genre and language, as well as his religious and political commitments, are difficult to make sense of without the context of Jinasēna and the literary milieu of this court a century earlier. Weaving together the literary and religious developments of Amōghavarṣa’s court, Pampa, a lay Jain and devotee of the Jain monk Dēvēndra, turned not to Sanskrit, but to the highly Sanskritized Kannada imagined in Śrīvijaya’s Kavirājamārgam to rewrite Jinasēna’s Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa in 941 C.E. He also wrote a version of the Mahābhārata called the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ (more popularly known as the Pampa Bhārata) in the same year.\textsuperscript{186} As the first extant poet to write a Kannada campū kāvya (poetry in mixed prose and verse) Pampa was and continues to be known as the ādikavi, or inaugural poet, of Kannada literature.\textsuperscript{187} Apart from being the first Kannada poet, Pampa is also notable for being the first of a surfeit of specifically lay Jain Kannada poets who almost exclusively wrote in this campū kāvya

\textsuperscript{186} Each of the sixteen chapters of Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam end with a short prose passage that praises the Jain monk Dēvēndra and briefly summarizes the chapter. Recent scholarly consensus dates Pampa’s Vikramārjunavijayaṃ to 950 C.E. Sheldon Pollock, The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 356; D.R. Nagaraj, “Critical Tension in the History of Kannada Literary Culture” in Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions From South Asia, ed. Sheldon Pollock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 106. Pampa himself is quite clear in the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ that both of these epic length campū kāvyas were composed in the same year; the Ādipurāṇam took three month to complete and the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ took five months (VAV, v 14.60). Additionally, there has been some confusion over the chronology of Pampa’s works. Pollock places Pampa’s Vikramārjunavijayaṃ first and the Ādipurāṇam second. Pollock, Languages of the Gods, 356 and 358 f. 60. Given that Pampa specifically mentions the Ādipurāṇam in the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ (and, as such does not mention the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ in the Ādipurāṇam), it is quite evident that the Ādipurāṇam is the earlier of his two texts.

\textsuperscript{187} Pampa is also later known as Hampa. He is also sometimes called the “foundational Pampa” (mūlapampa) or “the first Pampa” (ādipampa) to differentiate him from the poet Nāgacandra who went by the title “the new Pampa” (abhinavapampa). Ferdinand Kittel, Nāgavarama’s Canarese Prosody (Mangalore: Basel Mission Book & Tract Depository, 1875), xlv.
style. Commencing with Pampa, the inaugural phase of Kannada writing lasted until the twelfth century and is known both as the “Jain yuga” or Jain age and as the “campū period.” To be sure, this religious and literary periodization can be endlessly troubled. Although Jains dominated in the use of the campū genre, they were not alone; Vaiṣṇava and Vīraśaiva poets also adopted the campū literary form although at a later date. Campū kāvya also did not abruptly stop being produced in the twelfth century: examples of it exist into the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries and even later if we include the neo-classical period of the Woḍeyar court. And if campū kāvya persisted into the medieval or late medieval periods so too did poetry and literature produced by Jain poets. While never again as dominant on the literary scene, Jain poets were heavily patronized by the various medieval chieftains of coastal Karnataka such as the Ajilas and the Bairava Oḍeyars as well as by the Hoysaḷas, the Vijayanagara Empire, and finally the Woḍeyar dynasty. They wrote in ṣatpadi and tripadi meters and were among the first to experiment with sāṅgatya meter, which later became associated with the Vaiṣṇava Dāsa Sahitya

188 Śivakōṭi’s Vaḍḍārādhane and the Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurusapurāṇam, both prose works from the tenth century, are the generic outliers. While the vast majority of campū kāvyas were composed by Jains, there are several notable exceptions. Rudrabhaṭṭa, a smarta Brahmin writer active in Hoysaḷa court of Vīraballala, wrote the Jagannāthācaya (1180 C.E.) in campū style as did the Brahmin Cāvuṇḍarāya who composed the Abhinavadaśaṇaśaṇa (c. 1300 C.E.) in campū style in imitation of Daṇḍin’s Daśaśaṇaśaṇa. The Vīraśaivas too wrote campū kāvyas: Harihara wrote the Girijākalyāṇa (c. 12th C.E.), Dēvakavi the Kusumāvali Campū (1200 C.E.), and Siddhatālangāyūgi the Rājēndraśaṇa (c. 16th C.E.).

189 Gil Ben-Herut, Narrating Devotion, 129-132; T.V. Venkatachala Sastri, Pampa (New Delhi: Sahitya Academy, 1987), 7; and A.K. Wader, Indian Kāvya Literature: The Bold Style (Śaktibhadra to Dhanapāla) (Delhi: Motitlal Banarsidass, 1988), 658-659. The Jain/campū period was successively followed by the Vīraśaiva period that was also known as the ragaṇe or vacana period and a Vaiṣṇava or sāṅgatya period.

190 For example, Śadakṣaradēva’s three Kannada campū kāvyas Rājasēkharavilāsa, Sabaraśaṇkaravilāsa, and Rṣabhēndraśaṇa (c. 17th c.).
movement. All this aside, the tenth to twelfth centuries are remarkable for their intensity of Kannada Jain literary activity almost exclusively in the campū genre.

Yet, the “Jainess” of Jain campū kāvya is not always apparent in the works themselves. Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam, a celebration of the life of the first Tīrthaṅkara, is clearly a Jain religious poem. His Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, on the other hand, is not; it incorporates no discernible Jain elements and claims to follow Vyāsa’s traditional telling. Pampa himself captures the different orientations of his texts by stating, “On the entire surface of the world, I will make manifest here the entire Bhārata, the worldly, and there the Ādipurāṇam, the Jain scripture.”\footnote{VAV, v. 14.60 \textit{campakamāle}.} Sheldon Pollock has made much of this poetic division between the worldly (\textit{laukika}) and the scriptural (\textit{jināgama} or \textit{āgamika}), going as far as to describe Sanskrit \textit{kāvya} as, “this worldly (\textit{laukika}) in its themes, even when these concerned the divine.”\footnote{Pollock, \textit{Language of the Gods}, 13.} For Pollock, everything important about this literary moment—from articulating a distinct vision of the political to the novelty of vernacularization—occurs in Pampa’s Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, Pampa’s “secular kāvya,” and not in the Ādipurāṇam, a text he literally relegates to a mere footnote in the emergence of Kannada as a literary language.\footnote{Ibid., 340, fn.18.} I want to push back against and refine Pollock’s understanding of Pampa’s differentiation between \textit{laukika} and \textit{jināgama}. From my reading of both texts, Pampa certainly did not consider one text as the site of true poetry and the other as its pale scriptural imitation. Rather, Pampa saw his two texts not in opposition, but as poetic twins with distinct subject matters equally valid for the purposes of \textit{kāvya}. In the final chapter of the \textit{Vikramārjunavijayaṃ} he refers to them
repeatedly as a pair that collectively “trampled all other poetry” (kabbam ene munnina kabbaman ellam ikki meṭṭiduvu—note the plural ending of the verb). In Pampa’s eyes, the Ādipurāṇaṃ had just as must to do if not more with establishing Kannada literary norms as the Vikramārjunavijayam. While he refers to both his texts as kāvya, his larger metapoetic meditations on Kannada kāvya are in the Ādipurāṇaṃ while his broader reflections on language and place are found in the Vikramārjunavijayam. Together they articulate the vision of language, power, place, and poetry that Pollock so artfully identifies.

For Pollock, Pampa’s genius lies in his ability to imagine Kannada as a literary language in the image of Sanskrit as proposed by the Kavirājamārgaṃ. In practice, what that entailed is what Pollock refers to as a massive Sanskrit lexical invasion of Kannada. Indeed, the verses of Pampa’s poetry are filled with Sanskrit nouns (tatsama), Sanskrit-derived nouns (tatbhava), Sanskrit compounds, and even Sanskrit-derived verbs produced through a Kannada verbal infix (isu) without nary a Dravidian noun in use. Pampa’s poetry often appears like Sanskrit reconfigured with Dravidian nominal declensions and verbal conjugations, somewhat akin to Tamil and Sanskrit manipravalla, a form of writing in which the two languages are mixed together. Interestingly, of Pampa’s two texts, the Ādipurāṇaṃ is the more Sanskritized.

---

194 VAV, v. 14.59 {campakamāle}.
196 Unlike other Dravidian languages, Kannada never developed a formal manipravalla in which Kannada and Sanskrit are mixed. This makes sense given that Kannada emerged as a literary language already deeply intertwined with Sanskrit.
197 R.S. Sharma, Jainism and Karnataka Culture (Dharwar: N.S. Kamalapur, 1940), 82.
Indeed, in at least one verse of the Ādipurāṇam he attempts to write using only Dravidian words as if to show the reader that, if necessary, he can compose in that register too:

\[
kiviyiṃ bagevuguvoḍe koñ-
kuvetta posanuḍiyē pugugum uḷidudu sarusai
tavacarane māḍī sarusai-
tu vōkum ēṃ bageya baṭṭayaṁ muṭṭugumē. \quad \text{198}
\]

Crooked new words enter the mind through the ear.
The remaining words straightforwardly enter through direct movement
Do they touch the path of the heart?

With the exception of the Sanskrit-derived “avacarane,” this verse exclusively employs Dravidian words. Set within the Ādipurāṇam’s pervasive Sanskritism, its effect is to transform the very Dravidianess of Kannada into a poetic ornament to be strategically and selectively deployed like a metaphor or alliteration, but not as a ubiquitous figure of language itself. The consequence of Kannada’s Sanskrit lexical invasion in Pampa’s writing is that Kannada itself was transformed into an aestheticized feature of poetry. The use of Kannada words in either Pampa’s Vikramārjunavijayaṁ or in his Ādipurāṇaṁ is never incidental, but always marshaled for poetic purposes.

Beyond exemplifying a particular moment of vernacularity, Pampa also inhabits a moment when our extant literary and epigraphical archive thicken. We have a much richer picture of Pampa’s biography, his relationship to his patron Eastern Cāḷukya King Arikēsari II (r. 930-55 C.E.)—a feudatory of Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Kṛṣṇa III (r. 939-67 C.E.)—his religious orientation, the circumstances of writing, his views on language and poetry, and his broader reception within Kannada literature.\textsuperscript{199} The primary sources that provide

\textsuperscript{198} PĀP, v. 1.18 \{kanda\}.

\textsuperscript{199} Eastern Cāḷukya King Arikēsari II’s also patronized the Jain Sanskrit monastic poet Sōmadēva Suri, a near contemporary of Pampa and the author of the Yaśastilaka (959 C.E.) and the Nītvākyāmṛta. Puṣpādanta, author of the Apabhraṃśa texts the
much of this information come from autobiographical accounts that the poet gives of himself in chapter one of the Ādipurāṇaṃ and chapter fourteen of the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, much of which is supported by the Kurkyāl Inscription composed by Pampa’s brother Jinavallabha.\textsuperscript{200} I want to suggest that the comparative trove of information we have regarding Pampa, the very richness of this documentation, bespeaks a project of poetic self-fashioning that ultimately yielded a new figure: the lay Jain poet.\textsuperscript{201} Keep in mind, the poets heretofore focused upon were all monks. What is this distinction, what does it matter, and what can it tell us? One immediate point to make is that it is precisely because Pampa was a lay Jain that we know so much about him; the lives of Jain monastic poets were circumscribed by monastic order and practice and, therefore, less than susceptible to narrativization. With the lay poet Pampa, the emergence of biographical life as narratable (and worthy of narration or even fame) provides us with an aperture into the material dynamics that undergirded literary production and court patronage—the very dynamics that are obscured, hidden, or seemingly problematic for Jain monastic poets in the court.\textsuperscript{202} Yet, lay practice does not

\textit{Jasaharacariu, Mahāpurāṇu} (c. 959 C.E.), and \textit{Nāyakumāraracariu}, a contemporary of both Pampa and Sōmadēva Suri, was patronized by Bhārata and Nanne, father and son ministers of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III. Notably both the Sōmadēva Suri’s \textit{Yaśastilaka} and Puṣpādanta’s \textit{Mahāpurāṇu} make reference to Kṛṣṇa III’s victory over the Cōḷas.\textsuperscript{200} I am not the first to note the remarkable autobiographical information that Pampa provides in his two texts. Robert Zydenbos focuses on this aspect of Pampa in his article, “The Beginnings of Biographical Writing in Southern India in the Tenth Century The Ādipurāṇam of Pampa” in \textit{Biographie als Weltliteratur: Eine Bestandsaufnahme der Biographischen Literatur im 10 Jahrhundert} (Heidelberg: Mattes Verlag, 2009), 121-134.\textsuperscript{201} After the spate of Sanskrit Jain monk poets in Amōghavarṣa’s court, the following Kannada poets of the tenth to twelfth centuries were almost entirely lay-Jains, including Pampa, Ranna, Ponna, et. al.\textsuperscript{202} Jain monks are not allowed to own personal property beyond their peacock broom (\textit{piñchī}) and water pot (\textit{kamaṇḍalu}) and are not allowed to engage in monetary exchange. The precise mechanisms of Jain monks situated within courts is unclear. Were they even
translate secularity, but instead complexifies the role of religion in courts, in courtly literary production, in the literary work itself, and in the cultivation of literary languages.

Unsurprisingly, Pampa begins his Ādipurāṇaṃ by praising Ādinātha, followed by the luminaries of the Jain tradition. He then acknowledges the poets who came before him, and a succession of Jain monks. He describes the qualities of good poets and good poetry. He then makes a surprising transition from the metapoetic to the biographical:

This poem is eternally new to the world like an extremely deep ocean. Therefore, Pampa is an “ocean of poetic virtue” [kavitāgunārṇava]. He alone is celebrated by the entire world, is motivated by increased prosperity, and attainment of the highest fame. On account of promoting dharma during the course of mundane existence and on account of spreading that dharma, he is called “the rising of the essence of samsāra” [samsārasārōdaya]. His charming style of speech shines like an ornament of Sarasvati, a notoriously beautiful woman. Famous throughout the world, this very man is “the jeweled necklace of Sarasvati” [sarasvatīmanihāra]. His black skin is the color of the inside of a plantain tree. His hair is curly and pliant. His face is a lotus. His waist is soft. His speech is beneficial, succinct, and tender. His apparel is beautiful, charming, and agreeable. He is the best among the people born in the Vatsa Kula. He is devoted to his family. He is the image of self-confidence. He does not covet the fame of good poets. He speech is filled with flowing nectar. He fame extends like the moon during the month of Śarat. He is the moon to Kuvalaya forest that is the side glances of women. He is the jewel on the girdles on the hips of young women. He is the jeweled necklace on the breasts of damsels stooped over from the weight of their breasts.

physically present in the court? Was patronage routed to temples or monasteries? Or, improbably, did monks actually receive financial payment?

More specifically, he praises Ādinātha, the perfected ones (siddhas), the teachers (acāryas), the teachers (upādhyāyas), the monks (sādhus), the goddesses Cakrēśvari and Sarasvati, and the śrutaskanda (a visual representation of the lost Jain scriptures as a tree). He then moves on to acknowledge the Sāmantabhadrā, Kaviparamēśthi, and Pūjyapāḍa followed by the monks Grdhapincăcărya, Jacăcărya, Kīrtyācărya, Siddhanta Munśvara, Dēvēndra, Jayanandi, Kondakunda, and Akalaṅkađēva.

In these verses, Pampa’s literary pseudonyms are noted in Kannada within brackets.
He is the “jeweled necklace of Sarasvati” [sarasvatīmaṇihāra].
He is the red jewel on the waist cord of Kerala dancers.
He is the mirror of young Malaya woman.
He is the necklace on the firm beautiful breasts of Andhra women.
He is the illustrious “jeweled necklace of Sarasvati” [sarasvatīmaṇihāra].
Pampa has a voice deep like a dundubhi drum.
He was born in the year Dundubhi.
His fame is obvious like the sound of a dundubhi drum.
He is the bee on the lotus feet of the lord of Simhasanasuradundbhi.
Having said like this. I was given a name out of their own affection.
When the group of scholars says, “Please tell this” then I resolved to tell it.
Is it even possible for me to say this story that was narrated by a Gaṇadhara?
This story has depth that comes from the succession of Jinas beginning with Purudēva,
to the lineage of the gaṇadharas
and from this lineage extending to famous Vīrasēna and Ācārya Jinasēna.
They are endowed with knowledge and success. I am not so bold.
Why did I even contemplate swimming this ocean in the form of a story?
What is the fruit desired in this poem? Veneration, fame, and profit, these are enough.
The worship of the Jinēndras with stōtras eulogizing their qualities
is praised in the world.
This produces fame, liberation, and benefits.
Does it not come? What is given by others? What is done by others?
What is possible through others?
As if saying that unparalleled merit always comes to him who thinks,
he loved those who praise the famous Indra and Narēndra.
He systematically deliberated to the point of becoming absorbed to him.
He collected and described this story in poetry.
Is it possible to say this in that way, in this way, and in the middle way?
This story alone gives joy to good poets.
This story alone gives pleasure to the entire world of bhavyas.
In the famous Ādipurāṇaṃ, the qualities of kāvyas as well as dharma are understood.205

205

| idu niccaṃ posatarnavaṃbol atigambhīraṃ kavītvaṃ jaga-
| kkadaṅgaṃ kavītāponenta ilaṅkaivākhyātana-
| bhuyadayaṃśītinnatam uttāmayaṃ samsāra
tvāram-
pupadāriny dharmaṃ ādaṃ nimuccudaṛṣṇaṃ samsārasārdavaṃ || 1.27 {matēbha} |
| atisubhagege sanda sara-
vatigīṭana lalitaṅgīḷasame dal āla-
kriyavol esedapudu jagat-
prefītaṃ ṭane sarasvatīmaṇihāraṃ || 1.28 {kanda} |
| kārīgarbhaśyāmaṃ |
| mṛdukūtalaśīrōruhaṃ sarōruhavadanaṃ |
| mṛdumadhyamatanu hitamita-
And so begins one of the most detailed self-accounts of a poet in premodern Indian literature rivaled only by Bilhaṇa’s poetic autobiography at the end of the

\[\text{mṛduvacanaṃ alitamadhurasundararvēsaṃ} \text{||1.29 \{kanda\}}\]
\[\text{vatsakulatilakan abhijana-} \]
\[\text{vatsalan abhimānamūrti sukaviyaśōni-} \]
\[\text{rmatsaranamṛtamayōkti śa-} \]
\[\text{ratsamayasudhānśu niśadakārhitivānaṃ} \text{|| 1.30 \{kanda\}}\]
\[\text{vanitākaṭāṣaṇaṃ} \]
\[\text{vanacandraṃ yuvatijagånakānciḥratnaṃ} \]
\[\text{stanabharavinmrajagāṅkā-} \]
\[\text{stanamanjihāraṃ sarasvatimanḥharaṃ} \text{|| 1.31 \{kanda\}}\]
\[\text{kēraṇaṃtē kaṭē sū-} \]
\[\text{trāruṇamanātē malayayuvatidarpaṇan āndhrī-} \]
\[\text{nīrandhrabandhurasthana-} \]
\[\text{hāran udāraṃ sarasvatimanḥhāraṃ} \text{|| 1.32 \{kanda\}}\]
\[\text{dundubhigabhīraninadaṃ} \]
\[\text{dundubhisansatāṣaṇabhāvaṃ prakāṭayaśō-} \]
\[\text{dundubhi simhāsanasura-} \]
\[\text{dundubhipaticaraṇakamalabhraṅgam pampaṃ} \text{|| 1.33 \{kanda\}}\]
\[\text{endintu tamma tammanu-} \]
\[\text{gindaṃ pesariṭṭu budhasamūham idaṃ pē-} \]
\[\text{endoḍe pēḷkāmbage-} \]
\[\text{danden idennalave gaṇadharōditacaritaṃ} \text{|| 1.34 \{kanda\}}\]
\[\text{purudēvādiṇēndramāle gaṇabhṛtsantānam endi param-} \]
\[\text{pareyīṃ viśrutvārṇasēnācārya paryantam ā-} \]
\[\text{gire bandīkathe guṇpuvettudavaruṃ jñānarthisanpannar e-} \]
\[\text{ndiradāṃ dhṛṣṭanē kathābthiyaman ēnēsalam manandandenō} \text{|| 1.35 \{matēbha\}}\]
\[\text{kaviteyoḷ āsegeyva phalam āvudo pūje negaḷte lābham em-} \]
\[\text{bive valamindra pūge bhuvanasttu tamappa negaḷte mukti sam-} \]
\[\text{bhavisuva lābham embhive jīnēndraguṇastutiyinde tāme sā-} \]
\[\text{rave peḷrīvudēṃ peḷra mađuvudēṃ peḷraṇamappudēṃ} \text{|| 1.36 \{campakamāle\}}\]
\[\text{pesargōṇdhindrarēndravandyanaṃ oraldettēnūm ārīrve cīn-} \]
\[\text{tisidēṅgāṃ pavaṇīla puṇyam ene pūndolpindam ārante bhā-} \]
\[\text{visi tāṁ tanmayan āgi taccaritaman kāvyāṅgaḷoḷ kode ba-} \]
\[\text{ṇiśi pēḷdēṇa karmanijaryanantintunental barkumē} \text{|| 1.37 \{matēbha\}}\]
\[\text{iduve sukavi pramōda-} \]
\[\text{pradam iduve samastabhāvyaṅkārabhamadu-} \]
\[\text{pradam ene negaḷdādipurā-} \]
\[\text{ṇadoḷ arivudu kāvyadharmamaṃ dharmamamaṃ} \text{|| PĀP, 1.38 \{kanda\}}\]
What is so striking about Pampa’s self-account is its bombastic quality. Typically Sanskrit and even later Kannada poets employ a poetics of modesty defined by humility and deference to earlier poets and to the very difficult task of writing poetry. This poetics of modesty is particularly evident in the Jain monastic poetry in Sanskrit that precedes Pampa. In the same vein, Pampa’s describes the Ādipurāṇaṃ as “eternally new” (niccham posatu). This claim of novelty is similarly a break with established poetic norms: newness itself was not typically trumpeted or reflected upon. Pampa’s self-aggrandizing rhetorical style seems to anticipate and acknowledge that he saw himself as producing something distinctive and worthy of praise.

The first three verses work to establish Pampa’s best-known epithets that, through their repetition came to function much like literary pseudonyms. The first verse compares the Ādipurāṇaṃ to an ocean and thus, Pampa, its author, is naturally called an “ocean of poetic virtue” (kavitāguṇārṇava). The same verse also calls him the “rising of the essence of saṃsāra” (saṃsārasārōdaya) on account of his promotion and spreading of dharma in the world. The third verse, comparing Pampa’s speech (vāc) to an ornament

---

206 This is not to say that we do not have information about other poets. For example, a great deal is known about Harṣavardhana (c. 590-647 C.E.), the emperor of the Puṣyabhuti Dynasty ruling from Kanauj. He wrote three Sanskrit plays Nāgānanda, Ratnāvali, and the Priyadarśikā. However, the bulk of the extant biographical details about Harṣa do not come from his plays, but rather from court poet Bāna who composed a poetic biography in his honor entitled the Harṣacarita as well as the Chinese Pilgrim Xuanzang who recorded his visit to Harṣa’s court. Similarly we have anecdotal information about Kāḷidāsa from the Bhōja Prabandha of Ballala Dēva and free-floating subhāṣita verses. However, the case of Pampa is quite different. Much of the information is his own autobiographical account and strikingly aligns with the information given in Jinavallabha’s Kurkyāl Inscription.
207 PĀP, v. 27 {matēbha}.
208 Ibid.
of the goddess Sarasvati, produces the moniker the “jeweled necklace of Sarasvati”
(sarasvatīmaṇīhāra).²⁰⁹ Kavitāguṇārṇava, samsārasārōdaya, sarasvatīmaṇīhāra become
Pampa’s most recognizable epithets, typically placed in the last line of a verse, repeated
throughout the Ādipurāṇam, the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, and the Kurkyāl inscription as
well as by later poets.²¹⁰ Whether playing with his own names, those of his patron
Arikēsari, various characters in the Ādipurāṇam, or Arjuna in the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ,
naming is one of Pampa’s key resources to bring about poetic condensation of
praiseworthy people and glorified characters. For example, in the Ādipurāṇam, Pampa
says, “Together with Śri, I won over the Śri of victory. With my own strength, I, the
jeweled necklace of Sarasvati [sarasvatīmaṇīhāra], made the six parts of the earth my
own.”²¹¹ Read out of context, this verse appears as a statement that Pampa is making
about himself. Situated within the narrative of the Ādipurāṇam, it applies to both Pampa
and the character Bharata, the son of Ādinātha. Playing off his own title kavitāguṇārṇava,
Pampa calls Arikēsari an “ocean of virtue” (guṇārṇava) in the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ.²¹²
He then repeatedly uses the derived title gunārṇava to describe both Arikēsari and
Arjuna.²¹³ Pollock has rightly drawn our attention to this “allegorical mode” in the
Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, but this is not a unique feature of a single text; allegorical epithet

²⁰⁹ Ibid., v. 28 {kanda}.
²¹⁰ Ranna employs Pampa’s epithet kavitāguṇārṇava in verse 12.40 of his Ajitapurāṇam. Another common epithet of Pampa is sukavijanamanōmānasottamsahamsa see PĀP v. 2.78 {mahāsragdhare}.
²¹¹ PĀP v. 13.1 {kanda}.
²¹² VAV, v. 1.7 {mallikāmāle}.
²¹³ Ibid., v. 8.110 {utpalamāle} and v. 12.125 {kanda}. In the course of my dissertation research I read only selections from the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ. Therefore, my grasp of this text is far less firm than on the Ādipurāṇam. In turning this dissertation into a monograph, I plan to more fulsomely compare these two poems.
play is, in fact, a constitutive feature of Pampa’s writing. In fact, it appears that the “convention of the signatory verse” was a broader South India literary phenomenon. Such playful insertion of epithets throughout both of Pampa’s texts serve to constantly remind the reader of the meta-poetic condensation between real people and fictive characters that serves to bind together the world of the text to the world outside the text.

Pampa then combines glorifying name play with an intense attention to personal details. To return to the verses quoted above, Pampa attentively and thickly describes his physical appearance: his skin color, hair, face, body, speech, and style of dress. He then tells us that his family’s gōtra is the Vastakula. He has a self-confident personality free of envy. We then get a sequence of two verses that play upon the epithet of a “jeweled necklace of Sarasvati” (sarasvatīmanihāra), in which Pampa compares himself to the ornaments and accouterments of women from various parts of the Deccan. Pampa’s word play continues by deploying the various meanings of the word dundubhi to describe the drum-like timber of his voice, the year of his birth (902-03 C.E.), the resounding quality of his fame, and his lord. He then draws our attention to the impossible task of

---

214 About this Pollock says, “A telling point about local invention in general can be made on the basis of this kind of allegorization, which poets after Pampa would use repeatedly. Kannada scholars invariably identify the allegorical mode used here with the Sanskrit figure samāsokti, the ‘trope of abbreviation’ (which consists of characterizing the target implicitly while referring only to the source). But no Sanskrit rhetorician would ever have used this term to describe a structural feature of an entire narrative. To apply it to Pampa’s Bhāratam is therefore to assimilate him to a nonexistent cosmopolitan tradition and so diminish what may very well have been a vernacular innovation.” Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, 360-361.


writing the story of the Ādipūrana; he self-depreciatingly claims to lack courage in this task. Continuing in this seemingly modest vein, he contrasts the act of writing the Ādipurāṇa with the act of worshipping the Jina with stōtras. An Ādipurāṇa merely brings veneration, fame, and profit while Jina worship brings fame, liberation, and benefit. Yet, his attempt at modesty falls flat because he has already told us in the first lines quoted that he is not motivated by liberation, but is “motivated by increased prosperity [abhyudayaprāstiniṁuṭita] and the attainment of the highest fame [uttamaṁaśas].” Finally, he tells us that in his Ādipurāṇa we find both kāvyā and dharma. Collectively, these verses give us a sense of Pampa’s own embodiment and his subjectivity in a hitherto unattested style in premodern South Asian literature. Pampa describes himself in a thickly descriptive poetic mode strikingly similar to how he describes his heroes and, indeed, they often share epithets. Pampa’s characterizes himself in intimate terms is reflected in the form and content of his narrative.

We come to know Pampa even more deeply through his lengthy self-presentation in the Vikramaṁaṇavajyam. He says,

It is always beautiful in the Veṅgi country
from the land of the Malaya Mountains to the border of Himagiri.
In that place, one village Veṅgipalū by name is especially beautiful.
That place has agraḥāras called Vasanta, Koṭṭūr, Niḍugundi,
and the excellent Vikramapura.
On that path of success, Ūrjitapunya is foremost.
Endowed with political wisdom, a member of the Vatsagōtra,
having the ability to discern the precepts of all śāstras,
Māthavasōmayāja is famous up to that ocean.
Even just a little bit, Indra, the moon, the sun, and the wind god
invigorated his assemblage of hōma, mantra, and cakra.
He said this and nothing else, “At that very moment, it will impart a curse.”
The sphere of the direction will obey orders out of fear.
Not only that, having spread terror, he performed sacrifices of every sort.

---

217 PĀP, v. 1.27 {Matēbha}. 
In this manner, this is the power of Māthavasōmayāji.
The magical hair of the supreme ladies of the directions
is certainly like the women of the three worlds’ necklace.
From the spreading smoke of his oblations, his fame became black.
That son of Māthavasōmayāji, the best of men,
is called by the name Abhimānacandra.
He is highly famous for giving away all his valuable objects
including elephants, horses, excellent jewels, and gold to those who begged.
To Abhimānacandra, who was famous in the abode of the world,
is a son called Komaraya who possessed knowledge
arising from the all of the Vēdas and Vēdaṅgas
and whose conduct was suitably old-fashioned.
To that Komaraya is a son called Abhrāmadēvarāya.
He is an ocean whose gems are good qualities that pervade the earth and the sky.
He destroys the darkness of ignorance.
Oh! For a brahman family from the best jāti among all the jātis,
which faith is to be believed? The Jain dharma to be sure.
For believing in the Arhant among the various dharmas
and for having elevated that Jain jāti, his fame is legendary
His son is famous as an “ocean of poetic virtue” [kavitāguṇārṇava].
Pamba is a god on earth. He has the ferocity of the fourfold army.
He is immoveable. He bears beautiful ornaments.
He possesses the form of Manmatha. He has eliminated sin.
This poem established his fame.
His obligation to his master paid in millet caused the crowns of enemy kings
run away during a battle with his lord.
His fame perpetually shines in the world
and word of his excessive pride extends it further.
Kavitāguṇārṇava is famous. Is he a hero or a good poet? 218
Arikēsari lovingly invited him.
He established his fame on the earth out of giving that much.
In this manner, he desired to present this historical story.\textsuperscript{219}

\textit{rvakratuyājjīyādānālāvintu māṭhavāṣomāyājīyā || 14.43 \{utpalamāle\}}
varadigvanitege māṭadakuru
ā traibhuvesānkegām dal kaṇṭhā-
bharaṇam ene pareda tanna
dhvaradhūmade karindu māḍidāṃ nijayaśamaṃ || 14.44 \{kanda\}
tattanayak akhilakaritura-
gōṭtamanāṃjanakasāryavastuvan ereda-
grittu sāle negalāndan atipuru-
śottaman abhīmānacandran enipāṃ pesariṃ || 14.45 \{kanda\}
ātāṅge bhuvanabhavana-
khyātaṅge samastavēḍavēḍāṅgasa-
dyōtītacitaputu ucitapu-
rātaucaitaṃ tanūbhabhāṃ komarayaṃ || 14.46 \{kanda\}
ā komarayaṅgaavaniita-
āḷkāśavyāptanijaguṇānmaṇira-
āṭikaraṇ ajnānatamō
āṅkān abhraśaṅcāriaṃ tanayaṃ || 14.47 \{kanda\}
jātiyoḷ ellam uttamada jātiya viprakulaṅge nambal ē
māto jinēndradharmame valaṃ dore dharmadiṇḍaṃ endu namb ta-
jātiyoḷ uttarōttarome māḍi negalādān intirātmavi-
khyātiyān ātān ātana magaṃ negalāṃ kavitaṅgāraṇavāṃ || 14.48 \{utpalamāle\}
pampaṃ dhātrīvalayani-
limpaṃ caturaṅgabalabhayaṅkaraṇaṃ ni-
śkampāṃ latilāṅkara-
āṅḍa paṅcaśaṅkarupan apagapāpaṃ || 14.49 \{kanda\}
kavite negalāṭeyan niṣīde jālada pāḷī nijādhinaṁ
havadoḷatāniyakara paṭṭane pārīse sanda pempu bhū-
bhuvanadāḷāṅgul belage mikkabhiṃmahāna māṭu kīrtiyāṃ
vivarise sandan ēṃ kāliyo satkaviyō kavitāṅgāraṇavāṃ \| VAV, 14.50 \{campakamāle\}
The phrase “jōḷada pāḷī” is not immediately clear. Rice interprets this as a proper name “jōḷada country.” B.L. Rice, ed. Nāgavarmma, \textit{Karnāṭaka Bhāṣā-Bhūshaṇa: The Oldest Grammar of the Language}, (Bangalore: Mysore Government Press, 1884), xiv; Lewis Rice, “The Poet Pampa,” \textit{Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland} 14.2 (1882): 20-21. Sheldon Pollock’s reading of this term makes the most sense here. He says, “For his adherence to the ‘proprieties of the millet’ (jōḷada pāḷī), that is, his obligations to his master in war (for which payment was traditionally made in grain), he was rewarded with a grant of property (an agrahāra) lovingly described in the poem.” Pollock, \textit{Language of the Gods}, 356. This reading also supports the theory that Pampa was also a military general. I diverge from Pollock in the broader interpretation of this verse.
\textsuperscript{219} VAV, v. 14.51 \{kanda\}. 157
Here, Pampa situates his writing in a geography of linguistic prestige. As noted, Pampa is known as the preeminent poet of Kannada literature, the ādikavi, and yet the verses here do not praise the Kannada speaking heartland described in the Kavirājamārgam as extending from the Kāvēri to the Godāvari and whose linguistic essence was typified in the cities of Kisuvorą, Kopaṇa, Puligeṛe, and Oṅkunda. Instead, Pampa praises Veṅgi, the capital of the Western Cāḷukyas. This is a Telugu-speaking region that today is located in the state of Andhra Pradesh. Pampa and his family were undoubtedly polyglossic as these verses suggest; Pampa writes in Kannada and Sanskrit in the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ and his brother’s inscription, discussed below, is trilinguially composed in Kannada, Sanskrit, and Telugu. Beyond polyglossia, Pampa’s celebration of the Veṅgi country signals a larger point about language at this moment. By the time that Pampa was writing in the tenth century, Kannada was already a translocal prestige language that bound together the diverse polities of the Deccan. In contrast, to elite languages such as Sanskrit, vernacular languages like Kannada are supposedly circumscribed to a specific place or people. However, in practice, emergent vernacular languages just like elite languages circulated and were put to use in ways that exceeded a particular locality. As the preeminent language of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Eastern Cāḷukya cultural spheres, Kannada usage unsurprisingly transgressed the boundaries of modern linguistic states and followed the political boundaries of those interpenetrating political spheres in Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, and perhaps even Gujarat. Kannada, unlike Sanskrit, appears, in part, to have been a political language that spread following the boundaries of empire. Within this, the cultural penetration of

\[220\] KRM, vv. 1.36-37.
Kannada seems to have been strongest in the Telugu speaking regions; many of the earliest Kannada writers, including Pampa (b. 902 C.E.), Ponna (c. 950 C.E.), and Nāgavarma (c.1070-1120 C.E.), all hailed from Veṅgi. As a consequence of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Eastern Cāḷukya’s entangled political history, Kannada and Telugu have an equally close and entangled literary history. Narasimhacarya gets directly to my point, The connection between Kannada and Telugu literatures appears to be much closer than that between Kannada and Tamil literatures. One of the reasons this may be that the Calukyas ruled over both the Karnataka and Andhra countries and patronized both the languages. Several Telugu authors have also written in Kannada and vice versa. The meter Akkara which seems to be peculiar to Kannada is found in early Telugu works and inscriptions such as Nannayya-Bhatta’s Bhadrata and Bezwada Pillar inscription of Yuddhamalla. Two of the early Kannada poets, viz., Pampa 1 (941) and Nāgavarma I (c. 990) were descendants of men who belonged to Veṛgimandala. We learn from an inscription which records the grant of a village in 1053 by the Eastern Chalukya King Rajaraja to Narayana-Bhatta, who helped Nannaya-Bhatta in the composition of the Telugu Bhadrata, that Narayan-Bhatta was also a Kannada poet. Palukurike Somanatha and Vemulavada Bhima-Kavi, who were great Telugu poets, have written Kannada works.

Given this literary and linguistic prestige that Kannada quickly accumulated, Pampa did not stay in his beloved Veṅgi or write in Telugu, but instead went to Puligere, about which he says,

Poetry that possesses propriety, strength, and sweetness
now that is the poetry of Pampa.
Effortlessly and naturally, he composed in the Kannada heartland of Puligere, shinning with kings.

221 SP, vv. 1.41-42.
223 rājadrājakam enisida
sājada puligereya tiruḷa kannadaḍoḷ ni-
rvyājadesakadroḷ pudidoṃ
dōjeya baladimya kavite pamapana kavitē || VAV, v. 14.58 {kanda}.
While Pampa’s unreserved praise may belong to his homeland Veṅgi, it was in the Kannada heartland that he wrote poetry. This, after all, is the place of kings.

After grounding himself in a particular place, Pampa locates himself in a detailed genealogy starting with his great-great-grandfather Māthavasōmayāji, his great-grandfather Abhimānacandra, his grandfather Komarayya, down to his father Abhrāmadēvarāya. From this line of descent, we glean a great many historical insights. We know that Pampa’s family belonged to the Vatsagota; prior to Abhimānacandra they were Brahmins engaged in performing various sacrifices, and that Pampa’s father converted to Jainism after deeming it to be the best of all faiths appropriate for a brahman family of the best jāti. The account that Pampa gives of his father’s conversion is part of a fragmented and understudied set of medieval conversion accounts. There is some evidence of large-scale Brahman to Jain conversion and, indeed, a number of Jain poets in this period and even beyond were Jain converts. However, many Kannada speaking Digambara Jains then as well as now somewhat confusingly refer to themselves as brahmans and participate in a Jain caste system that is unique to the Digambara sect and Kannada-speaking region. Here, the case of Pampa is clear: he celebrates his family as

retranslated Pollock’s rendering of this verse to more fulsomely capture the emphasis given in the Kannada.

224 VAV, v. 14.48 {utpalamāla}.
226 The Digambara Jain caste system is first articulated in Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇam. Ādinātha creates the lower three castes in response to the chaos caused by the wish-fulfilling trees dying out. Bharata creates the brahman caste out of meritorious Jains. While many Deccani Digambara Jains claim to be brahmans, many belong to the lower castes and practice agriculture. This type of livelihood is an anathema for west Indian
being both brahmans performing Vedic sacrifices as well as Jains. He sees no contradiction in praising these identities within the same poetic space.

In his typically bombastic style, Pampa describes himself in grandiose terms (as a god on earth, the embodiment of the god of love, etc…). He then identifies the *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ* as the poem that establishes his fame (*negaḻte*). Verse 14.50 is curious in that it places Pampa on the battlefield of his Lord Arikēsari and ends with the provocative question, “Is he a hero or a good poet?” The implied answer to this question is undoubtedly both. This has led some scholars to assume that Pampa was a military general, a Jain, and a poet—a not altogether unusual combination explored further in chapter four. Pampa then describes how Arikēsari sent someone to invite him (presumably to court), which is followed by a series of verses that celebrate the intimate relationship between Pampa, an “ocean of the poetic virtue” (*kavitāguṇārṇava*), and Arikēsari, who Pampa calls an “ocean of virtue” (*guṇārṇava*). Again, the first chapter of this dissertation considered the constellation of Jain poets who were affiliated, to varying degrees, with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court of King Amōghavarṣa. None of those poets made such explicit claims as Pampa, who presents himself as a court poet of Arikēsari and praises his patron through the poetic twining of Arikēsari and the hero Arjuna in the *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ*. The formality of such a relationship through patronage is similarly

---

Śvētāmbara Jains who largely belong to mercantile communities. In the same vein as Pampa, Pollock notes that Vādīghaṅghala, a commentator on Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyadarśa*, appears in a Gaṅga grant (963 C.E.) in which he is described as a Jain whose grandfather was an orthodox Brahmin. Sheldon Pollock, “Ratnaśrijñāna,” in *Encyclopaedia of Indian Wisdom: Prof. Satya Vrat Shastri Felicitation Volume*, ed. Ramkaran Sharma (Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 2005), 638.


228 VAV, v. 14.54 {campakamāle}. 
unattested to before Pampa, who received the village of Dharmapura as a land grant from Arikēsari for writing the *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ*.\(^{229}\)

How are we to understand Pampa’s autobiographical accounts in the *Ādipurāṇam* and the *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ*? In premodern South Asian literature, the question of authorial intention or even the question of authorship itself often stands outside the purview of our archives. Pampa is thus something of an anomaly. The rich picture that he paints of himself reveals a conscious self-fashioning of what it meant to be a lay Jain in a medieval Deccani court. He is first and foremost a poet, but he himself is also beautiful. He is a ladies’ man, but also a family man. He is religiously meritorious as well as a hero. For all of this, he is famous. Through this hyper laicity, he is everything *but* a Jain monk. Therefore, these autobiographical accounts produce a figure whose religious commitments are shaped by a lay subjectivity rather than a monastic one.

Many of the autobiographical details that Pampa provides about himself in the *Ādipurāṇam* and the *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ* are further attested to in the Kūrkyal Inscription in Karimnagar District, in modern day Telangana, composed by Pampa’s brother Jinavallabha.\(^{230}\) Formally, the inscription is unique for its *campū kāvya* style.

---

\(^{229}\) Ibid., v. 14.57 \{campakamāle\}.

\(^{230}\) Discovered by B. Venkataramanayya in the mid-1960s, this inscription is known both as the Kurkyāl Inscription and the Gaṅgādharam Inscription. In addition to the Kurkyāl Inscription and Bhagiyabbe’s two inscribed bronzes, there is also, apparently, an inscribed stone at Basavatarkanagar near Bodhan in Nizamabad District, Telangana that the historian Yadagiri Rao claims is Pampa’s *samadhi*, or death, memorial. I have not been able to obtain a copy of this inscription, however, people in the village collectively remember this site as sacred to Pampa. As the Telugu poet, V.P. Chanda Rao notes, “In fact, local people are not aware that he was a poet and therefore offer *pooja* believing him to be a *rushi* (saint).” P.Ram Mohan, “Kannada Aadikavi Pampa’s Samadhi Lies in Ruins at Bodhan.” *Thehindu.com*. Published 07/16/2014, accessed 05/30/2015. http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-andhra-pradesh/kannada-aadikavi-pampas-samadhi-lies-in-ruins-at-bodhan/article6215344.ece
trilingually composed in Kannada, Sanskrit, and Telugu. The inscription was written on a hill called the Ṛṣabha Mountain under a carving of the Jain goddess Cakrēśvari and six Tīrthaṅkara images. In the initial long prose passage, Jinavallabhā describes himself as a Kamme brahman of Vendippaṟṟa in the Veṅgi region, a member of the Šrivatsa gōtra following Jamadagnipañca Ṛṣī. In contrast to Pampa’s patrilineal focus, he then gives his matrilineal line of descent; his mother is Abbaṇabbe, the granddaughter of the astrologer Siṅgha of Aṇṇigeṟe in Beḷvola and the son of Bhīmapayya, the grandson of Abhimāṇacandra of Ni đuṇgoṇḍe of Guṇḍikarra. Jinavallabhā is explicit in his Jain

---


232 The image of Cakrēśvari carved above the Kurkyāl Inscription along with Pampa’s explicit praise of her in the *PĀP*, v.1.7 *{mahāśragdhare}* strongly suggests that this goddess was the family’s tutelary deity.

233 *JKI*, opening *vacana*. In his *Śāntipurāṇam*, Ponna also identifies as Kamme Brahmān from the Veṅgi region. *SP*, v. 1.44. Rice notes that, “There is a large class of Smārta and Mādhva Brahmans in Mysore called Kamme, but they seem to have no knowledge of the origin of their name. They all speak Kannada, except a few who use Telugu. The Kannada Kamme are found chiefly in the eastern division; the Ulcha or Urcha Kamme in the south and the east; the Babbāru Kamme in the south and west.” B.L. Rice, “Early Kannada Authors,” *JBBRAS*, New Series 15.4 (1883): 300, fn. 2.

234 According to D.R. Nagaraj, the question of Pampa’s mother tongue has been a source of great debate in Telugu language scholarship. D.R. Nagaraj, “Critical Tension in the History of Kannada Literary Culture,” 329, fn. 8. The genealogical information provided by Pampa’s *Vikramārjunavijayam* and the Kurkyāl Inscription greatly clarifies this question. These sources read together suggest that Abbaṇabbe, Jinavallabhā and Pampa’s mother, was likely a Kannada speaker from Aṇṇigeṟe, the capital of the 300- Beḷvola in modern-day Dhārwār District who married into a Telugu speaking family from Veṅgi. Given the relative distance and possible linguistic barriers, the circumstances of their union is fascinating. Whitney Cox has tracked the circulation of a few individuals across the subcontinent to the Deccan including a Kasmiri scribe named Mallayapaṇḍita in the Nīgunda Plates of Vikramāditya VI as well as a Saiva officiant named Jñānaśivācarya in inscriptions of Vikramāditya II at Paṭṭadakal. Whitney M. Cox, “Scribe and Script in the Cālukya West Deccan,” *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 47.1 (2010): 4-
religious commitments; he describes himself as a discipline (guḍḍa) of Jayanandi Siddhāntabhaṭāra of the Paṇḍaraṅga lineage of the Potthage branch of the Koṇḍakunda Dēsi Gaṇa monastic lineage. Beyond the carved images above the inscription, Jinavallabha also constructed a Jain temple called the "ornament of the three worlds" (tribhuvanatilaka), a water tank called an "ocean of poetic virtue" (kavitāguṇārṇava), and forest called the “play of the god of love” (madanavilāsa) on the Ṛṣabha Mountain located north of Dharmapura in the middle of Sabbināḍa.

In naming his tank an “ocean of the poetic virtue” (kavitāguṇārṇava), Jinavallabha notably invokes one of his brother’s most well known literary pseudonyms. From its content to its form, the specter of Pampa looms large in the conceptual imagination of Jinavallabha’s poetic inscription. The first verse of the inscription in Sanskrit even starts with a vocative address, “Oh brother!” and commands its reader to “journey from wherever to Dharmapura, the city of Dharma,” the land-grant that Pampa received from King Arikēsari. Imitating Pampa’s bombastic style, he repeatedly trumpets the fact that he is Pampa’s noble younger brother (pampāryyānuja). Continuing in Sanskrit, he says, “Jinavallabha, the supreme brother of the one called Pampa, was

---

5 and 19, fn. 33. This evidence coupled with the movement of Telugu poets from Andhra to the western Deccan (not to mention the famous Kashmiri poet Bilhaṇa) suggests that from perhaps the tenth to twelfth centuries, this region served an important cultural and political hub.

235 The term guḍḍa can mean a boy or a pupil, but is commonly used in inscriptions to describe a lay-disciple. J.F. Fleet, “Nisīdhi and Guḍḍa,” IA 12 (1883): 99.

born to sing beautiful songs comprised of many parts, to produce poetry with undulating sound, to utter sweet-nothings, to serve all the sādhus, to indulge in pleasure, to enjoy the ladies, and to offer pūja to the Jina.”

This verse, in particular, brings together a set of qualities that are typically seen as unrelated. On the one hand, Jinavallabha is a man about town skilled in poetry, music, the cultivation of pleasure, and in keeping female company. On the other hand, he is a lay-disciple devoted to Jain monks and the worship of the Jina. While I have made a distinction between these identities, Jinavallabha freely intersperses these personal attributes, seeing them not in contrast, but as complementary. In describing himself in these terms, Jinavallabha captures a key style of Pampa’s poetry that, as we will see, resists an opposition between the aesthetic, the courtly or cultivated self, and the religious.

As previously noted, Pampa identifies the Vikramārjunavijayam, and not the Ādipurāṇam, as the poem that made him famous. In that same text, he describes receiving the village of Dharmapura from Arikēsari. Jinavallabha further elaborates on this and directly quotes Arikēsari as saying, “For the famed Vikramārjunavijayam, the city of Dharmapura is yours alone forever,” (arakēsari sanda vikramārjuna vijayakke dharmapuram[ra]m) thereby specifying that the land grant was in honor of Pampa’s Kannada rendition of the Mahābhārata. The Vikramārjunavijayam (along with Ranna’s Sāhasabhīmavijayam) is something of a curiosity within Jain literary history. Jains long produced their own specifically Jain renditions of the Mahābhārata and the

\[\text{gītaṃ gātamanēka bhēda subhagaṃ kävyāni sōccāvacaṃ vācā vācayituṃ priyāṇi vadituṃ sādhūpakarttuṃ satāṃ bhōgānśēvitumānganā ramayituṃ pūjāṃ vidhātuṃ jinējānītē jinavallabhah paramidaṃ pampābhidhānānujaḥ ||} JKI, v. 2 {Śārdūlavikrīḍita; Sanskrit}

\[\text{JKI, v. 7 {Campakamāle; Kannada}.} \]
that were enfolded into the larger cosmological structure of the sixty-three important men of the Jain tradition (triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurusa). Despite being a Jain, Pampa did not choose to write a Jain version of the Mahābhārata, but instead extolled and emulated Vyāsa’s traditional telling of the narrative. Given the historical details surrounding the production of the Vikramārjunavijayam and its status as a “secular kāvya”, one might wonder, was Pampa famous as a Jain poet or just as a poet? That is to say, did Pampa’s personal religious belief matter at all in the literary economy of the Eastern Cāḷukya court? Recent scholarship has argued that in this time and place, a poet’s religious affiliation mattered for naught. However, if Jinavallabha is to be believed, then yes, Pampa’s identity as a Jain very much mattered to his patron Arikēsari. First of all, Jinavallabha clearly states, “The belief of Pampa is the glory of the Jain teachings, which are given in an edict in the form of an inscription of fame” (kīrttiśāsanam ene koṭṭa śāsanada pampana nambidudondu jainaśāsanada). In the very next verse, he says, “Arikēsari admired Pampa for accumulating fame through dharma such that it was impossible for any other religion to flourish. Arikēsari gave Pampa that village, an abode of brahmans.” This last line complicates Jinavallabha’s earlier statement by implying that Arikēsari might have given Pampa a land grant for his impressive propagation of the Jain faith. What if, as Jinavallabha suggests, Arikēsari patronized Pampa not in spite of

Ponna is said to have written a no longer extant poem in a similar style “secular kāvya” called the Bhuvanaikarāmabhuyudaya that compared his patron Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III with the hero Rāmā. Anthony Kennedy Warder, Indian Kāvya Literature: The Bold Style (Śaktibhadra to Dhanapāla), (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988), 664.
As noted in an earlier footnote, I am not as familiar with Pampa’s Vikramārjunavijayam. In a further project, I plan to more fully analyze this poem in light of its possible Jain influence.
See, for example, Pollock, Language of the Gods, 428.
JKI, v. 7 {campakamāle; Kannada}.
Ibid., v. 8 {mattēbavikṛđita; Kannada}. 
his Jain faith, but because of it? Jinavallabha makes clear that Arikēsari held Pampa’s Jain belief in high esteem and that Pampa’s own fame was not simply based on the fame of the Vikramārjunavijayam, but also derived from his dharmic Jain practice.

The question of fame, the central preoccupation of premodern South Asian poets including Pampa, undergirds the entirety of the Kurkyāl Inscription. Jinavallabha mimics Pampa’s genre, style, and sensibility and, in so doing, seeks to supersede him. Switching to Kannada, he boasts about the impossibility of constructing a Jain image at Rṣabhangiri, which, of course, he succeeds in doing.244 Dotted with his donative activities, he describes how the celebrated mountain rivals Pampa’s own fame.245 Most telling he says,

Oh! With the true nature of poetic skill, this younger brother is able to praise, read, write, disseminate, and to tell of the cleverness and greatness of the famed Pampa’s genuine poetic skill. On account of that, Jinavallabha, the beloved groom of the bride of speech, he alone knows how to make it known to the entire world.246

Jinavallabha describes himself as possessing the “true nature of poetic skill” (kavitvada tattva) whereas his brother possesses “genuine poetic skill” (satkavitva). The subtle differentiation in language is the mere quibbling over minor differences; Jinavallabha claims that his poetic ability is on par with or even supplants his more famous brother. On account of this, it is Jinavallabha, and not Pampa, who is married to speech tropically personified here as a bride. What’s more, the thrust of this verse is that Pampa’s own poetic skill was only knowable through Jinavallabha’s own poetic exaltation.

Jinavallabha’s ability to describe is in marked contrast to Pampa, who when confronted

---

244 JKI, v. 4 {campakamāle: Kannada}.
245 JKI, v. 5 {campakamāle: Kannada}.
246 caduramaymeya satkavitvada sanda pampana tamman ô [rvvade] pogaṭeye bājisal bareyal kavitvada tattvadoḷ pudidu nērvvade pēḷal urvvigapūrvam āgire ballon appudaṅ orvvone vāgvadhūvaravallabhaṃ jinavallabhaṃ || JKI, v. 6 {Taraḷa; Kannada}
with the unfathomable—be it beauty, fame, etc...— rhetorically and modestly asks who or how can it possibly be described, praised, or expressed.\textsuperscript{247} Here, Jinavallabha seems to answer the questions that pervade Pampa’s Ādipurāṇa by declaring it to be himself, Jinavallabha who can give voice to fame.

Even though Jinavallabha rhetorically binds Pampa’s fame to his own, beyond the Kurkyāl Inscription we have no further trace of him while Pampa’s literary celebrity endures until today.\textsuperscript{248} Pampa’s centrality within the canon of classical Kannada literature crystallized relatively early and, indeed, he is a central figure in the emic literary historiographical framework that develops in the early medieval period.\textsuperscript{249} A mere fifty-six years after Pampa’s Ādipurāṇa and Vikramārjunavijaya, Ranna, a later Western Cāḷukya court poet of Tailapa II (r. 957-997) and Satyāśraya (r. 997-1008 C.E.),

\textsuperscript{247} This type of question occurs throughout the Ādipurāṇa in many different iterations. For example: “how is it possible to describe?” (baṇṇisal ēm barkume), v. 1.69; “is it possible to express?” (idu ennaḷave), v. 1.34; how can the pleasure of the land of pleasures be praised?” (sukhamam ēm pogaḻdappudo bhōgabhūmiya) v. 5.30; and “How much more can I praise such a woman?” (annal innu ē pogaḻvem), v. 6.80.

\textsuperscript{248} In his article “Two Inscriptions of Pampa’s Sister-in-Law,” Narasimha Murthy discusses two Jain bronzes purportedly commissioned by the wife of Jinavallabha, the author of the Kurkyāl Inscription. On the base of one of these bronzes, originally held by Purnachandra Nahar at his museum in Calcutta and whose current location is unknown, is engraved with the line, “The image was caused to be made by Bhagiyabe, wife of Jinavallabha” (Śri jinavallabhana sajjana bhagiyabe mādisida pratime). “Two Inscriptions of Pampa’s Sister-in-Law Bhagiyabbe,” in Indian History and Epigraphy: Dr. G.S. Gai Felicitation Volume, eds. K.V. Ramesh, S.P. Twari, and M.J Sharma (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1990), 219. The base of the second bronze—held by the Government Museum of Madras, but originally obtained from a Jain temple in Kogāli in Bellary District, Karnataka—is similarly inscribed with the line “basadi of Bhagiyabbe of Paithan” (paiṭṭani Bhagiyabbe basadi), Ibid., 220. Together Narasimha Murthy reads these inscriptions as indicative of the Jain donative activity of Jinavallabha’s wife who came from Paithan, Maharashtra. While his conclusions are tantalizing, I find the evidence to be too scant to definitively assign these bronzes to Pampa’s sister-in-law.

\textsuperscript{249} By “historiographical framework” I refer to the classification of Pampa as the first poet (ādikavi) and Pampa, Ranna, and Ponna as the three jewels of Kannada literature (triratna).
incorporates Pampa as the first member of a cohort of Kannada poets known as the “three jewels” (*ratnatraya*) in his *Ajitapurāṇaṃ* (c. 997 C.E.). He says,

> Among the poets, these three famous poets Pampa, Ponniga, and Kaviratna, are as if purified by the three jewels of correct vision, correct knowledge, and correct conduct.
> Do others exist who illuminate the Jina’s word? From the fortunate poet Pampa, the great advancement of speech became famous. Among his virtues, it was beautiful.
> Is the imperial poet who composes in both languages [*ubhayakavicakravarti*], the new sovereign [*abhinavacakravarti*] his equal?
> Among the poets, Pampa and Ranna possess merit. These two are singularly accomplished.
> These two are very fortunate.
> Do the virtues of Pampa, an ocean of poetic virtue, and Ranna, a jewel of a poet, elicit envy?
> The *Ādipurāṇaṃ* and *Ajitapurāṇaṃ* shine in the three worlds, On account of this, *vaiśya* standards and the *brahman* flags are said to be Pampa and Ratna.
> Previously, in the kingdom of the Raṭṭas, Pampa and Ponna were extremely famous to the entire world. So too is Ranna, the jewel of a poet who composes in both languages [*ubhayakaviratna*], honored by Narapati.
> He became famous in the Cāḷukya kingdom.
> Possessing the powerful speech of the dear *Jainēndra* and the strong and distinguished speech of the *Śabdānuśāsana*, he shown.
> Bowled down to both these grammars, Kaviratna was beautiful.
> Through the inspiration of the three jewels, Ratna’s *Paraśurāma, Cakrēśvara*, and *Ajitatirtha Caritas*, shone in the three worlds.  

---

250 The poet Ponna, whose birth name was Savaṇa, was also know as Ponniga, Homma, and Ponimayya. Rice, “Early Kannada Authors,” 300. The Kannada word Ranna is a *tatbhava* of the Sanskrit word for “jewel” (*ratna*). He was interchangeable called Ranna, Ratna, or Kaviratna.

251 *Ubhayakavicakravarti* is a title most typically associated with Ponna, however, in this passage Ranna uses it twice to describe himself.

252

kavijanadōl ratnatraya-
pavitram ene negalḍa pampanaṃ  ponniganum
kaviratnanum ī mūvar
kavigaḷ jinasamayadipakar perar oḷarē || 12.38
subhagakavipamaniṃ vā-
gvihavōnnti negalδudavana guṇadōḷagesedi
rdubhayakavicakravartiga-
m abhinavakavicakravartigam doreyoḷarē || 12.39
kavigaḷoḷ avar irvare pu-
In the first of these verses, Ranna derives the title *ratnatraya* for the three poets Pampa, Ponna, and Ranna through an illusion to the three central tenants of the Jain faith (*ratnatraya*) of correct vision, knowledge, and conduct.\(^{253}\) This selection of verses closes with a similar metaphor in which Ranna credits the inspiration of his three literary works (*caritas*) as deriving from the *ratnatraya*, thereby exploiting the double valence of the *ratnatraya* as a referent to the three great Kannada poets and the three central Jain religious tenants. In so doing, he appropriated the name of a Jain religious ethos as a literary historiographical device—a device that scholars still reference today—in which he forever bound his name to his earlier predecessors.\(^{254}\) Out of the three poets, he singles

\[\text{nyavantar ivare kṛtārthar ivare sobagar} \]
\[\text{kaviratnaṃ mēṇ guṇakke maccaram uṇṭē} \mid 12.40\]
\[\text{trijagadoḷ ādipurāṇamu-} \]
\[\text{m ajitapurāṇamunan eseeye pēḷduarindaṃ} \]
\[\text{dvijavamsadhvajavaiśya-} \]
\[\text{dhvajar ennadar oḷare pampanaṅ ratnamaṅ} \mid 12.41\]
\[\text{dharāṅge negalḍar sale ra-} \]
\[\text{ṭṭarāyadoḷ munne pampanuṅ ponniganuṅ} \]
\[\text{naraṇatifūjaṃ cāḷū-} \]
\[\text{kyārāyadoḷ negalḍar ubhayakavi kaviratnaṃ} \mid 12.42\]
\[\text{abhimatajainendravacō-} \]
\[\text{vibhavaṃ śabdānuśāsanaprabhavacō-} \]
\[\text{vibhavamoḍ an ubhayavyākaraṇaparinātatam kaviratnaṃ} \mid 12.43\]
\[\text{karam eseduvu ratnāraya} \]
\[\text{parikalpade paraśurāmacaritaṃ cakṛē-} \]
\[\text{śvaracaritaṃ ajitārdthē-} \]
\[\text{śvaracaritaṃ ratnāninde bhuvanatrayaḍol} \mid AP, 12.44\]

\(^{253}\) Ibid., v. 12.38

out Pampa specifically for greatly advancing the Kannada language. And it is to Pampa, and not to Ponna, that Ranna compares himself; their texts shine together in the world and the vaiśya and brahman banners are theirs alone. Moreover, the specific literary works that Ranna stresses in this passage are worthy of further attention. Within the religio-literary framework of the ratnatraya, Ranna suggests that his and Pampa’s texts of note are not their “secular” kāvyas, the Sāhasabhīmavijayaṃ and the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, composed in honor of their royal patrons, but rather their religious kāvyas, the Ajitapurāṇaṃ and the Ādipurāṇaṃ, composed in honor of the first and second Jinas. Our to hand interpretative framework for understanding literary patronage in this moment understands “secular” in explicit praise of a royal patron as the site of true poetry, power, and patronage, while religious kāvya was an act of personal devotion (that had no real worldly or literary bearing). Our contemporary contradistinction between patronage and religious kāvya is proved anachronistic in Ranna’s own formulation of the source of poetry and location of power. Immediately after he names the Ajitapurāṇaṃ and the Ādipurāṇaṃ as twinned models of poetic merit, he highlights the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Cāḷukyas as the sources of their poetic fame. I read the proximity of these verses as significant. From Ranna’s point of view, the question of the relationship between religious poetry, fame, and patronage was, in fact, a non-question.

Although Ranna formalized Pampa as the first member of the ratnatraya poets, he was just one among many poets from this period who recognized Pampa’s poetic genius. Some, like Aggaḷa in his Candraprabhapurāṇaṃ (1189 C.E.), praised Pampa within the enduring framework of the ratnatraya;

Pampa loved with tenderness. Ponna spread with love. Ranna, the lord who is a jewel of a poet, narrated with devotion. Previously, the value of those three poems matched the three worlds. Afterward, I narrated this expansive poem, the Candraprabhōdayām. Is it not a part of such pricelessness?  

And, like Ranna before him, Aggaḷa takes advantage of the poetic capaciousness offered by the three-jewel imagery to praise Pampa, Ponna, and Ranna and to ask if his poem too is worthy of such value to be considered a jewel. Others poets like Nayasēṇa in his Dharmāṁṛtam (1115 C.E.), praise Pampa as one of a broader group of illustrious predecessors;  

Asaga’s local style, Ponna’s beauty achieved great heights, Pampa’s singular vision produced unprecedented use of rasa, Gajāñkuśa’s worthy and shining wisdom about correct meaning, Guṇavarma’s knowledge, and Ranna’s shining manner— May they forever reside on the earth, in the mind, and in my poetry.  

Nayasēṇa unbinds Pampa from the ratnatraya and praises him within a list of poets and the qualities of their poetry—here Pampa is notable for his use of rasa or aestheticized emotion. Similarly, Rudrabhaṭṭa, in his Jagannāthavijayaṃ (c. 1185 C.E.), singles out “Pampa’s style” (pampana rīti). Acaṇṇa, in his Vardhamānapurāṇaṃ (c.1195 C.E.) and Bāhubali Paṇḍita in his Dharmanāthapurāṇaṃ (1352 C.E.) simply invoke him in a long


list of praiseworthy poets, and Kamalabhava, in his Śāntiśvarapurāṇaṃ (c.1225 C.E.), calls him a “true poet” (satkavi). During the height of the Kannada campū period from the tenth to twelfth centuries, it was almost unthinkable to write poetry without first praising Pampa. Indeed, Pampa was such an enviable figure that the Jain poet Nāgacandra was called the “new Pampa” (Abhinava Pampa) for writing a version of the Rāmāyaṇa called the Rāmacandrācaritapurāṇaṃ (1105 C.E.). Mimicking the relationship between Vālmīki’s Rāmāyaṇa and Vyāsa’s Mahābhārata, this text was seen as the twin of the Pampa Bhārata and was therefore called Pampa Rāmāyaṇa.

While in no way exhaustive, in tracking these references to Pampa we trace the boundaries of Jain (and some non-Jain) poetry produced during the campū period. But even after the height of the classical campū kāvya was over, Pampa was still revered as a poetic ideal. Nāgarāja, in his Puṇyāsravaṃ (c. 1331 C.E.), says “The true poet Pampa will always be the sole master of spreading Kannāḍa” (pasaripa kannāḍakkoḍeyan orvane satkavipampan āvagaṃ). With these words, Nāgarāja neatly captures Pampa’s broader reception in


258 Nāgacandra’s Kannada version of the Rāmāyaṇa was one of the first Kannada texts to be edited and published. B.L. Rice, The Pampa Rāmāyaṇa or Rāmāchandra Charita Purāṇa: An Ancient Jain Poem in the Kannada Language (Bangalore: Mysore Government Press, 1882).

259 D. Javaregauda, ed. Nāgarājakavi Viracita Puṇyāsrava (Mysore: Maisūru Viśvavidyānilaya, 1977), v. 1.16. This text is a Kannada campū translation of
classical Kannada literature. However, it was left to the poet Madhura in his
Dharmanāthapurāṇam (1385 C.E.), to give a name to Pampa’s position within Kannada
literature; he styles him the “inaugural poet” (ādikavi).260

4. Cāvuṇḍarāya: Military General, Literary Patron, King, and Jain Devotee

If Pampa and his Ādipurāṇam brought us to the rarefied world of a medieval
Deccani court and its poetry then the Western Gaṅga military general Cāvuṇḍarāya and
his Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurāṇam or Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam are both located in and
outside a courtly setting. Unlike the majority of figures from the medieval period, we can
track Cāvuṇḍarāya through a wide range of sources. In the majority of the inscriptions in
which he appears, Cāvuṇḍarāya is depicted as a military general whose valor and battle-
field success garner him a slew of titles, for example, "the lion on the stage of battle"
[rāṇaraṅgasinga].”261 Collectively, the inscriptions and texts surrounding Cāvuṇḍarāya
depict him as a martial figure of significant stature within the Gaṅga kingdom. However,
Cāvuṇḍarāya also moves through these medieval sources in other guises as a Jain
devotee, a patron of Jain religious and literary textual production and, ultimately, a king
in his own right.

His most important inscription is the Tyāgada pillar (Chāgada Kamba in
Kannada) at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa dated to 983 C.E. This pillar, which bears ornate vines
scrolling up three-fourths of the column, sits on a four-faced base on which the epigraph
is inscribed (Fig. 2.2). Within the landscape of Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa dotted with various types

Ramacandra Mumukṣu’s Sanskrit Punyāśrava Kathākośa. See Ramacandra Mumukṣu,
Punyāśrava-kathākośa, ed. A.N. Upadhye (Sholapur: Gulabchandra Hirachnada
Doshi, 1964).
260 N. Basavaradhya, Bāhubali-Madhura Sampuṭa, v. 1.36.
261 EC Vol. 2, no. 170 (English), 114 (Kannada), 86 (transliteration).
of monuments, there is no other pillar that takes on this particularly unique visual and material form. Perhaps drawn to its singularity, in 1180 C.E. Heggaḍe Kaṇṇa entirely cleared two faces of Tyāgada inscription, wiping away untold historical detail for a mere two lines of his own inscription (Fig. 2.3). 262 Judging from the two senses of tyāga as abandonment or distribution, this pillar could have perhaps served as Cāvuṇḍarāya’s samadhi memorial (i.e., the site of his bodily abandonment). Alternatively, B.L. Rice interprets the pillar as a site of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s generosity to pilgrims, a site for the “distribution of gifts.” 263 However, with the record palimpsestically wiped away, we are simply left to wonder at its historical import and lament the loss of perhaps what was the most robust account of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s activities at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa.

What is left of the Tyāgada inscription includes sparse biographical details that primarily celebrate Cāvuṇḍarāya’s military achievements in protecting the Gaṅga kingdom. 264 The achievements outlined in the Tyāgada pillar inscription are reiterated and elaborated in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam, in which Cāvuṇḍarāya describes himself as:

In this way, the famous Cavuṇḍarāja is called: “an expert in warfare” [samaradhurandhara] because of his victorious valor in the battle of Khēṭaḍa. With his lord’s command, his elephant trampled the heads of his Cāḷukya enemy called Vajjaladēva; "the primary hero of the of the world" [jagadēkavīra] who readied for battle on the field of Gōnura in the Noḷamba war; "the lion on the stage of battle" [ranaraṅgasinga] because of manifesting victory in battle in which he alone attacked that king at the fort of Uccaṅgi; and "the staff of death to enemy families" [vairikulakāḷadanda] because of killing Tribhuvanavīra, and others at the fort of Bāgehaḷi and on account of driving Gōvindara to enter mountains and caves. He is

262 Ibid., no. 109, 170 (English), 114 (Kannada), 86 (transliteration.).
263 EC Vol. 2, introduction, 55. The idea of a “pillar of generosity” seems to have had some currency in this period. Pampa’s Vikramārjunavijayam includes a reference to Cāḷukya King Arikē sari “establishing a pillar of generosity” (cāgada kambamaṃ niṃśi). VAV, v. 1.50.
264 EC Vol. 2, no. 109, 169-170 (English), 113-114 (Kannada), 85-86 (transliteration).
an army-chief called Rāja at the fort the King Kāma; he is a great warrior called Bāsa; he is a wrestler called Sivadhara; he is an...called Kuṇika; he has a title called Poyisala; he is a hero called Prthu; he is a water-drinker called Biha; and he is a youth called Bikkiga. He attacked Balāja and other heroes by piercing their bodies. He is called: “one who does not need any help” [asahāyavirksa] because of the strength of his victorious arms; “a sensitive person” [madhurācaya], “a great warrior in battle” [raṅganabhaṇjanuṭṭa], and Caladanka Gaṅga because he attacked and killed a great warrior to revenge the death of his brother Nāgavarma; “a veritable Paraśurāma to men in battle” [samarapurusaparāṣurāma] because he exhibits power. He forcibly and indiscriminately took and gave from anyone that he conquered. He is un conquerable in war while chasing away all other the warriors. He is called: “a demon to foes” [pratipakaṣarākṣasa] because he makes the world free from thorns in the form of enemies; “a slayer of warriors” [bhaṭamāri] because he has killed thousands of heroic warriors; ”a jewel-mine of perfection” [samyaktvananākara] because he is endowed with qualities such as fearlessness; "a pure sky" [śaucāca(bhra)ṇa] because he does not covet the wealth or women of others; and "a true Yudhiṣṭhira" [satyayudhiṣṭhira] because his speech is truthful in moments of merriness and in forgetfulness. He is called a “protector of virtue” [gunamaṃ kāpon] because he protects his own virtues and those of others. He is a "good man" [ollidan] because of being committed to the virtues of truth, renunciation, and so on. He is a wish-fulfilling gem to warriors [subhaṭacūḍamaṇi] because he is the head jewel of the circle of the brave who furiously attack their enemies....He resides on the peaks of all the supreme mountains among great people equal to the directional elephants.265

265

intensity negālādcāvunḍarājau munne manne la khēṭadada kālagol aḍona besadi vajjaladevanajahampayemba calakalikkeya taleyan ari (naliqa) taleyan ane metṭidante tannāne pariy gelda sāhasadīṃ samaradhurandharanum gōnura bayalo qōdi banda(bandoḍṭida) nojambare kālēgadol jagadēkavīranamun (vē) tēri tanna vāra(bala)mam meredudaraṇīṃ virāṃrāṇḍanum, umu(um)caṇgiya kōṭeyol rājayaka(jyeta)nolekkatam iṛvaṃ tōrvan peṇeditgur raṇajayamaṃ meradudaraṇīṃ ranaragasiṃganum bāgehali(yūra) kōṭeyol tribhuvanavīraṃ modalaqe palaramum kondu gōvirandaranam (dēvanaṃ) girkandaramaṃ (dol) pugisidudaraṇīṃ vairikulaṅkālaḍanandaṇum nṛpakāmanakōṭeyol rājan embadhatā (dala) numam bāsan embakac(e)yanamum, siva(dha)ran embam jetṭiganumamum kuṇika(ṇuṇa)n emba kaṭṭaṅgogodanumam kuṇika(ṇuṇa)n emba kaṭṭaṅgogodanumam poyisalum emba birudanumam prthuven emba bīranumam bihan emba appuṇiganumam appukoḷlu bikkigan emba mugdhā(pūrga) yiganu(um)maṃ peṣaraṃ kaligalaṃmaṃ balālgaḷum ane meyyoṃ peṇeditgur gelda bhujavikramadinasahāyavikramanum tanna tammanum nāgavaramanum konda pagege caladāṅkadaṇḍa(gaṅga)num(gan)raṅgana(ran)bhaṭṭanuṭṭanu bāldonam enisa da(mu) dhūrācayamanum dāḷit(u)yīṭo)kondu, ba(da)lamam nṛapududaraṇīṃ samarapurusaspāraṣurāmanum mattam ārgam itum tettum marjiyaḍṭayīsi bālva jetṭagarān aṭṭhum daṇḍinole sādhyaṃ māḍi niṣkāntakam māḍidudaraṇīṃ pratipakṣrākṣasamunum, kelada nelada malayamanḍaladudāravārabhaṭkotiyantave kondudarīṃ bhaṭamārīyum niṇśaṅkādīgusamanvant appudarīṃ samyaktvananākaranum
Collectively, the inscriptions and texts surrounding Cāvuṇḍarāya depict him as a heroic figure of significant stature within the Gaṅga kingdom. However, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s marital person did not stand in opposition to his identity as a Jain devotee and patron. As we will see, his military titles persist into the sphere of his religious activities: in the title of his lost Kannada commentary on the Gommaṭasāra and in Ranna’s lost Paraśurāmacarite.

Cāvuṇḍarāya’s most notable, prominent, and enduring devotional religious act was, of course, the construction of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. Starting at the base of the statue we find the inscription, “Śrī Cāmuṇḍa Rāja had it made,” composed in Kannada, Marathi, and Tamil (Fig 2.3). While the Bāhubali monolith is certainly the most impressive expression of his Jain devotion, it is not the only one. Cāvuṇḍarāya appears in a variety of other Jain sources from the period including an inscription from Nagar taluk that described him as worshipping the monk Nēmicandra. Beyond his relationship with Nēmicandra, he also describes himself as a student of the monk Ajitasēna in his own Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṁ. Nēmicandra’s Gommaṭasāra, a distillation of the Jain Dhavaḷā scripture, quite self-consciously incorporates Gommaṭa, one of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s other names, into its title. The colophon verses of this text confirm that Cāvuṇḍarāya’s preceptor was Ajitasēna and celebrate him for constructing the

parāṅganāparadravyaparāṇmakhan appudaṛiṁ śaucāca(bh)raṇanum pariḥsadoḷam vismaranadollam sūṇṭavacanan appudaṛiṁ (ridoṁ) satyayudhiṣṭhiranum svaparagunaparirakṣaṇaikakāraṇan appudaṛiṁ gunamaṃ kāponum satyayugdigungagolōkṣūṃ illadunar in ennum oḷḷidanum ari(t)pracaṇḍaviraṁḍan(i)la śikhanḍimaṇḍanamāṇiyappudaṛiṁ subhaṭacūḍamaṇiyum embāṅkadanāṃ kamālegal{i}, diggajaghaṭāghategalolāṃ sakala kulācala kūṭaṅgalolāṃ nelase. 


267 CP, v. 20.
Bāhubali monolith.\textsuperscript{268} The commentary on this text states that the, “Gommatasara was edited and collected by Śrī Nēmicandra Cakravarti at the request of Rāja Camundrai, whose qualifications have been declared in such high language by the author in the above verses. It appears that when the saint was editing the book in Prakrit, its explanation was being written in Canarese by the Rājra himself at the feet of the saint.”\textsuperscript{269} This description of Čāvuṇḍarāya studying at Nēmicandra’s feet was also painted in an illuminated manuscript of unknown origin reproduced in the 1917 edition of Nēmicandra’s \textit{Dravyasāṃgraha} published in the Sacred Books of the Jains series (Fig. 2.4).\textsuperscript{270} Čāvuṇḍarāya’s Kannada commentary on the \textit{Gommaṭasāra} is no longer extant, but another commentary by Kēśavavarṇī cites it by the name \textit{Vīramārttaṇḍi}, which, of course, is the title Čāvuṇḍarāya received after his performance in the Noḷamba war.\textsuperscript{271} As a lay disciple of two of the most illustrious Jain monks of the medieval Deccan and apparently a religious commentator in his own right, Čāvuṇḍarāya was deeply imbricated within the robust forms of intellectual engagement that occurred between the Jain lay and monastic communities and the extreme forms of lay devotion that were embodied in his fifty-seven foot monolith.

Čāvuṇḍarāya’s celebrity on the battlefield and as a prominent Jain devotee was only matched by his profile as a courtly literary patron of Jain Old Kannada poets. The famed poet Ranna—Western Cāḷukya court poet and one of the three jewels or \textit{triratna} of Kannada literature described in the previous section—vaguely references him in a list of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{269} Ibid., v. 272, 428.
\item \textsuperscript{270} Sarat Chandra Ghoshal, ed. \textit{Dravya-sāṃgraha}, Vol. 1 (Arrah: C.J.P. House, 1917), xxxviii.
\item \textsuperscript{271} Ibid., xli.
\end{itemize}
Gaṅga patrons in his *Gadayuddhaṃ* and by the name “swāmi” in his *Ajitasēnapurāṇam*.

Moreover, it has long been suggested within Kannada literary scholarship that Ranna’s no longer extant *Paraśurāmacarite* was a eulogy to Cāvuṇḍarāya’s military title Paraśurāma composed in the same style that Pampa compared his patron Eastern Cāḷukya King Arikēsari II to Arjuna in his *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ* and Ponna compared his patron Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III to Rāma in his no longer extant *Bhavanaikarāmābhhyudayaṃ*. Beyond his relationship to Ranna, one of the preeminent poets of Old Kannada literature, there is some indication that Cāvuṇḍarāya patronized or was even the brother (as his self-account in the passage above from the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* suggests) of the Kannada poet Nāgavarma, author of the *Chadōmbudhi* and the *Karnāṭaka Kadambari*. Indeed, Cāvuṇḍarāya appears to have been one of the most important (and by that I mean generous) Jain patrons of the tenth century deeply embedded within the literary landscape of the local Western Gaṅga and Eastern Cāḷukya courts. His literary donative activities *across* courts highlight the connectivity between them as well as their shared literary styles and tastes.

The portrayal of Cāvuṇḍarāya as military general, Jain devotee, and literary patron that develops in these sources is rich and elaborated, but not unusual. Military generals, often petty chieftains or minor feudatories in their own right, comprised one

---

272 B.S. Sannaiah and Ramegowda, eds., *Sāhasabhīmavijayaṃ* (Gadāyuddhaṃ) (Mysore: Prasararanga, University of Mysore, 1985), vv. 1.34 and 1.40. Thank you to Timothy Lorndale for pointing me in the direction of these verses. *AP*, v. 12.50.


clear profession that became associated with and patronized Jainism, perhaps more than any other, in the medieval period. The seeming contradiction between Jainism’s nonviolent emphasis and warfare was quickly resolved by medieval Digambara Jain thinkers who proposed a range of acceptable (or at least less karmically serious) acts of violence necessary for physical protection (virōdhīhīṃśā) and for the maintenance of one’s livelihood in occupations such as farming (ārambhājāhīṃśā). One explanation of Jainism’s martial appeal is that the ideal men put forth by the tradition (the twenty-four Jinas, Bāhubali, etc…) were modeled on a vision of an ideal hero. Indeed, the entirety of the Jain tradition can be understood as one large martial metaphor: the Jina—from which the word Jainism is derived—literally means “conqueror.” Moreover, by the tenth century, Jains in the Deccan had gone beyond a mere figural relationship with power and had cultivated close relationships to regional kingdoms and dynasties. For example, the inscriptions of the Gaṅgas, Hoysaḷas, and the Kadambas all bear witness to the centrality of Jainism in the medieval Deccan by incorporating Jain elements in their origin myths of their kingdoms. Indeed, Jains stand out on the religious landscape of the medieval Deccan for their close proximity to and conscious cultivation of political power. The

marital rhetoric of Jainism and its vast network of political patronage made Jainism an obvious and appealing avenue for military generals to assert their own power.

Moreover, military generals of this period like Cāvuṇḍarāya frequently were petty chieftains and small-scale regional powers in their own right who were co-opted into a nested system of authority commanded by a translocal polity; and, indeed, several sources including his own name suggest this was the case with Cāvuṇḍarāya. His name in Kannada means King Cāvunda or Cāmuṇḍa through the suffixation of the word rāya, the Kannada tatbhava of the Sanskrit word for king (rāja). The connotation of his name carries through in the Śravaṇa Belgoḷa sthalapurāṇa recorded by Colonel Mackenzie in which he is described as “Chāmunda Rāja, king of Dakshina Madurā, and the descendant of Jaina Kshettri Pāṇḍu.”

276 A paṭṭāvali of a the Sēna Gaṇa similarly describes him as a “resident of the city of Dakṣiṇa Madhurā” (dakṣinamadhurānagarivāsi).

Padmarasa’s Bhujabali Carite, a later rendition of the Bāhubali story that incorporates Cāvuṇḍarāya and the construction of the statue at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, calls him King Cāmuṇḍa (cāmuṇḍanṛpa), glossing his Kannada name in Sanskrit.278 The reliability of these sources is questionable at best, however, they correctly suggest that Cāvuṇḍarāya saw himself and was received as something of a would be king. Allied with the dominate political power of this region and personally committed to a heterodox soteriology, Cāvuṇḍarāya was uniquely positioned to intervene into the production and reproduction of Jainism in this period.

5. Conclusion

277 Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, Vol. 1, part 1 (1912): 38
278 B.S. Sannayya, Padmarasa Viracita Bhujabali Carite (Shravanabelagola: Chandragupta Granthamala, 1989), vv. 2.4-5.
In looking at the lives, texts, and reception of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa poet Jinasēna, the Eastern Cāḷukya poet Pampa, and the Western Gaṅga poet Cāvuṇḍarāya, we can draw a number of commonalities between them. These individuals fashioned themselves and were received as complexly composite figures that exceeded the label of author or poet. Jinasēna wrote the first Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa, but he was also a monk and an institutionally important member of the Sēna Anvaya, a monastic lineage that bore his name. Pampa wrote the first Kannada Ādipurāṇaṃ. His literary style and archival persona capture him as entrenched within the court. With Pampa, we palpably see the material interactions in play that undergirded the life of a court poet. Pampa’s life takes on further texture through allusions that he was a military general. After all, he himself poses the question, “is he a hero or a good poet?”279 We assume both. In this regard, Pampa shares a similar complex persona with Cāvuṇḍarāya who was at once a Western Gaṅga military commander, a prominent literary patron, a devotee, and possibly a local king or chieftain in his own right. As will become clear in the following chapters, these poets were indebted to each other’s work; Pampa cites Jinasēna as a formative influence and Cāvuṇḍarāya literally incorporates sections from Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ into his own rendition of the narrative. The poets and their works circulated with a larger cultural and political milieu that, at this particular moment, was reliant on Jain monks, poets, and military generals as the connective tissue to bind it together.

This chapter sought to situate the political realities of premodern political life and, in particular, interpolity dynamics alongside the multiple social and religious lives of poets and their texts. In so doing, we see clearly how the real world struggle to maintain

279 VAV, 14.50 \{campakamāle\}
political connections between the imperial center and its peripheries was much more easily facilitated by the connections made by the circulation of poets and their texts. While Amōghavarṣa is something of a failed king when judged on the historical basis of battlefield success and territorial expansion, the literary environment fostered by his court (and the poet Jinasēna specifically) produced a cohesive Rāṣṭrakūṭa cultural dominion defined by the presence of Jain literati and the use of Kannada as a literary language. Lasting from the tenth to the twelfth century, the inaugural “Jain phase” of Kannada literary history—note above as problematic although not entirely inaccurate—might be better labeled “the cultural legacy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court.” The developments made within his court shaped the forms of literature and language at both the center and the periphery, binding the region together into a coherent cultural and political sphere.
CHAPTER 3

The Kingdom is a Poisonous Flower: Kingship as a Path to Renunciation

1. Introduction

If, in the last chapter, King Amōghavarṣa (814-878 C.E.) represented the cultural, literary, and political pinnacle of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, a century later, King Indra IV (973-982 C.E.) represented the dynasty’s twilight in the face of increasing pressure from Western Cāḷukya King Tailapa II. In the hundred years intervening between their reigns, Jainism’s influence within the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court ebbed and flowed only to revive again at the dynasty’s demise. Indra IV ended his life and, in many ways, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire by Jain ritual death (sallēkhanā) at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa in 982 C.E. An inscription at this site, written in complex allegorical Kannada poetry, highlights in great detail Indra IV’s virtues from the battle-field to the bedroom, only briefly narrating his sallēkhanā in a few verses at the very end (fig. 2.1). The following lines are typical:

King Indra is praised by all people as
an ever yielding wish-fulfilling tree in the world,
a lion skilled in cleaving apart the skulls of the enemy kings’ elephants,
a necklace nestled between the breasts of beautiful women,
a swan floating on the lotus pond that is the mind of great poets.

Indra IV appears within the inscription as a good king who provides for and protects his kingdom, woos women, and inspires great poets. In contrast, Indra IV’s religious turn is

280 B.L. Rice, ed. Epigraphia Carnatica Volume II: Inscriptions at Sravaṇa Beḷgoḷa (Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press, 1889), no. 57, 144-146 (English), 69-73 (Kannada), 53-56 (transliteration). Sallēkhanā is typically practiced towards the end of one’s life as a way to expunge the last traces of karma that adhere to the body (in Jainism karma is a material substance). Given that the practitioner of sallēkhanā withdraws from the world in pursuit of liberation, the act of ritual death is not considered suicide within the tradition since it is not motivated by emotion.
281 Retranslated from Ibid., 145 (English), east face.
only alluded to through a set of verses on the south face of the pillar in which his battlefield prowess and austerities are collapsed through a double entendre (ślēṣa). The complexity of these verses—too convoluted to render into English—lies in the potency of militant metaphors as a way to capture the challenges and hardships of renunciation and its related practices. Although war and religious austerity are, in some ways, diametrically opposed activities, one grounded in the mundane and the other in the spiritual, they share an underlying set of practices. The connection between these spheres is disclosed through their shared vocabulary: battle and austerity both generate fame and praise, require the vanquishing of an enemy, employ methods of attack, and are fundamentally reliant upon courage. The overwhelming force of these verses—that both trace Indra IV’s worldly accomplishments and collapse his martial skill with religious austerity—depict a vision of kingship fully lived that culminates in renunciation. That is, Indra IV’s various guises of a South Indian king as lover, literary patron, and military commander serve to guide him down the path of renunciation and equip him with the sensibility, skills, and subjectivity necessary for spiritual pursuits.

Towering over the built landscape of the small hill at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, the very

---

282 I have not translated or quoted here from these verses because the Kannada is too convoluted to properly render into English. B.L Rice’s translation is largely impenetrable as well. Ibid., 145-146 (English). Rice notes in his introduction that “The obscurity of the allusions and unusual meters have presented serious difficulties in certain parts, and the best Kannada scholars in Bangalore, Mysore and other places have tried in vain to satisfactorily explain them. Though the greater part of the inscription seems to be of an allegorical character, its main purport is perfectly clear. It is a record of the death, in Śaka 904, the year Chitrabhābu, (A.D 982), of Indra Rāja, and is engraved on four sides of a high pillar erected in a maṇṭapa near the front of the same Tērina basti.” Ibid, 20-21. On the subject of militant metaphors, one could argue that the entire formulation of Jainism is based around such metaphorical thinking. The name Jainism derives from the twenty-four spiritually perfected figures of the tradition called Jinas, literally conquerors. Therefore, Jainism itself is feasibly translated as the religion of conquerors. Of course, the objects of such conquest are enemies in the form of karma.
materiality of Indra IV’s inscription also reflects the ways in which renunciation and ritual death are understood as a fulfilment of worldly kingship (fig. 2.2). As S.Settar notes, "Literally departing from earlier convention, the memorial of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra IV is engraved on the four sides of a huge oblong pillar as if it is a pillar of victory established by a triumphant monarch. Highlighting the political and personal achievements of the king, it concludes by commemorating his ritual death." For all of Indra IV’s military and romantic accomplishments detailed in the inscription, it is his victory in death that warrants elaborate commemoration in stone. I read the materiality of Indra IV’s pillar inscription as further indexing a connection between kingship and renunciation as hierarchically adjacent spheres of human experience: kingship necessarily precedes and gives rise to renunciation. Indra IV’s pillar appropriates an extant artistic form variously called pillars of fame (kīrtistambha), triumph (jayasambha), and victory (vijayastambha) that were used to commemorate military accomplishments in the medieval period. Indra IV’s pillar makes clear the connection between battle and austerity by employing the same material and visual style used to commemorate a king’s military victory. If, as the inscription suggests, battle with enemy kings and battle with...
enemy *karma* are related practices then military victory and spiritual victory too are analogous and merit celebration through shared forms of commemoration. By adopting the form of a *vijayastambha*, Indra IV’s pillar attests to his final and ultimate victory, his spiritual victory over *karma*.

I begin this chapter with this anecdote of Indra IV’s *sallēkhanā* inscription as a foray into a world anticipated and imagined by Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa* (860 C.E.) a century earlier, a world in which the public proclamation of royal renunciation via Jain ritual was possible and even worthy of memorialization and praise. The first chapter of this dissertation explored King Amōghavarṣa’s court as a discrete institutional site of literary production. I argued that the adoption of Sanskrit by Jain authors within this court reflected a new Jain orientation towards the king, the court, and the broader cosmopolitan world of Sanskrit literary culture. Jinasēna, the preeminent Jain poet to emerge from Amōghavarṣa’s court, saturated his *Ādipurāṇa* with the life stories of kings who renounce their kingdoms. Jinasēna’s text and the *Ādipurāṇa* genre more broadly provided the ideological and theological scaffolding that made acts of royal renunciation imaginable and even laudable. Jinasēna was by no means the first to suggest that proper kingship should culminate in the renunciation of one’s kingdom; indeed, the concept of royal renunciation was already current in Buddhist, Brāhmaṇical, and Jain traditions. However, Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa* is the first Jain text in Sanskrit to adopt a poetic idiom in order to theorize this distinctive relationship between Jainism and political sovereignty routed through the figure of the king. This chapter offers a reading of Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa* as envisioning kingship as a deeply ambivalent position, a position born of previous merit, but whose experience cultivates worldly dispassion in its subjects. Through the language
of poetry, Jinasēna captures and enacts kingship as a path to renunciation. In so doing, Jinasēna's text anticipates the language and materiality of Indra IV’s memorial pillar constructed a century later. His Ādipurāṇa imagines a possible world through which Indra IV’s memorial is made legible.

From its opening salvos, the Ādipurāṇa strives to create a homologous relationship between the imagined world of the text and the material world of the court. In the outer frame story of the Ādipurāṇa, King Śrēṇika asks the Jain sage Gautama to narrate the life of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha. This device establishes a key parallel. As Paul Dundas notes, "The point is implicit: as Gautama instructs Śreṇika in the behavior of a Jain king, so does Jinasena instruct Amoghavarṣa." Composed as a Sanskrit court epic, the parallel between the text and the court continues; the central characters of the Ādipurāṇa are kings, ministers, and members of the royal family who mirror the worldly characters of the court. Here, the text puts the familiarity of an embodied courtly life to work within a Jain religious framework in which the implications of such a life are radically transformed. If the Ādipurāṇa represents an idealized vision of a court, then an ideal king is one who follows the kings of the Ādipurāṇa along the path of Jain renunciation—which most importantly entails the

---


renunciation of kingship itself. It was in court poetry and not in political theory that Jinasēna’s vision of Jain kingship could be imaginatively enacted. The courtly form and its courtly subject matter neatly coincide and mutually reinforce one another.

The Jain eulogistic and literary materials explored in the previous chapters served to establish the rich Jain literary milieu associated with Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amōghavarṣa's court. These materials have been read as disclosing Amōghavarṣa's conversion to Jainism and, even more specifically, Jinasēna’s responsibility for his conversion as the king’s religious preceptor. While Jinasēna praises Amōghavarṣa and regnally dates his texts to the king’s reign, the exact nature and implications of their relationship are provocatively inconclusive. This eulogistic material can only take us so far, to an historiographical edge where empirically verifiable realities tantalizingly point to speculative possibilities. In this chapter, I work from the assumption that Jinasēna's texts—and specifically his Ādipurāṇa—prove a far more fruitful and untrodden ground for understanding the relationship between the Jain community, kingship, and sovereignty in the medieval Deccan. I follow Paul Dundas’ suggestion that "a far richer source for the understanding of the Jain perception of kingship, is, in fact, the

If the prior chapter explored the literary traces in which Jain poets addressed Amōghavarṣa as an ideal Jain king, this chapter asks: What does kingship look like routed through a Jain perspective?

To begin to answer this question, this chapter explores the generic, literary, and ultimately theoretical aspects of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa in order to demonstrate how this text conceptually bridges religious and political spheres. I argue that Jinasēna articulates the religious and the political by establishing kingship as a privileged path to renunciation. I further argue that the reception of Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa as scripture forecloses a reading of the text as theoretically invested in the soteriological speculation of kingship as a path to renunciation. To build towards this argument I consider the ways in which Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa employs genre and plot repetition as a literary strategy that mirrors Jain notions of transmigration (samsāra). The repetition of royal renunciation is enfolded within this specifically Jain soteriology. From an examination of the literary strategies of the Ādipurāṇa, I move to Jinasēna’s generic claims and enactments of the Ādipurāṇa as epic court poetry (mahākāvya). I argue that kāvya became an avenue through which to circulate Jain religious literature within the court as well as a method to intervene into the ideological reproduction of the court through novel religious and political arrangements formulated through the figure of a renunciant Jain king. Within this formulation, kingship is depicted as a deeply ambivalent position; its attainment is generated by meritorious acts in a previous life, but it is to be discarded in the present like a poisonous flower. The tension surrounding kingship—as both a boon and a burden—makes sense only through the proposition that kingship itself serves as a heightened

worldly sensorium that paradoxically cultivates worldly dispassion. Jinasēṇa makes this connection clear through the co-optation of the idiom of kingship as a metaphorical logic through which to figure the Jain telos of liberation; a true king renounces his kingdom. Jinasēṇa does not restrain his claims about the proper practice and path of kingship to poetry, but places his definitions of kingship into the mouths of the Ādipurāṇa’s kings as they hold forth in their courts. Through both poetry and formal injunction, Jinasēṇa imagines a world in which kingship is proximate to and serves as a path for renunciation. This reading of Jinasēṇa’s Ādipurāṇa is generated through an attentiveness to its language, genre, and poetics and the courtly audience that these literary elements solicit. I conclude the chapter by considering how the courtly quality and political potency of Jinasēṇa’s text is lost when this audience disappears. Instead, much like the reception of Jinasēṇa’s own biography explored in chapter two, his Ādipurāṇa is also confined to the religious sphere.

2. The Ādipurāṇa: Narrative Plot and Repetition

For premodern religious literature, the generic names with which authors tagged their texts mattered a great deal, and Jinasēṇa’s Ādipurāṇa (The First Purāṇa or The Purāṇa of Ādinātha) is no exception. In the various Hindu traditions, the purāṇas, or ancient lore, are a category of amorphous cosmological meditations on the divine history of the world that often bear distinctly sectarian overtones. As John Cort notes, "the Hindu Puranas are extensively preoccupied with the activities of the gods and goddesses on an often transcendent level"; conversely, “the Jain Puranas are concerned with the lives of specific human beings who lived at specific times in Jain history.”289 As such, the Jain

---

"purāṇa" most closely resembles the Western genre of biography." In titling his text the Ādipurāṇa Jinasēna signaled his participation within a tradition of writing in which the well-known Hindu genres of the purāṇa and mahāpurāṇa are recast to narrate the deeds of the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition (triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurūṣa) across a cosmological scale of endlessly descending (avasarpinī) and ascending cycles of time (utsarpinī). As such, Jinasēna was not simply writing a biography of Ādinātha in the traditional sense, one bound by the parameters of a single life span, but rather a biography that traces a soul along with an interconnected group of souls through multiple rebirths on its transmigratory journey towards liberation.

The Ādipurāṇa begins the saga of the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition and so naturally Jinasēna had to commence with this story. That is to say, Jinasēna’s decision to write a purāṇa of Ādinātha, rather than a purāṇa of any of the other twenty-three Tīrthaṅkaras, was no accident, but a matter of generic necessity. Apart from the requirements of the mahāpurāṇa, the figure of Ādinātha had a particular allure in the medieval period. Although all twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras are supposed to identically represent a perfected Jain state, in practice certain Tīrthaṅkaras—such as Ādinātha, Pārśvanātha, and Nēminātha—became popularized above and beyond the others.

---

290 Ibid., 187.
291 In the Jain tradition, time is understood as a wheel whose current spin cycle avasarpinī is divided into three ascending eras followed by three descending eras in which ethical activity, and by extension the possibility for liberation, deteriorates. At this point, Jain dharma will die out and the utsarpinī cycle will commence in the reverse order of three descending eras followed by three ascending eras. Paul Dundas, The Jains (London: Routledge, 2002), 20.
292 The prominence of Jina-specific devotion within the Jain tradition is legible in literature, temple and image building, and ritual culture. For example, in her ethnography of Jain lay women’s devotional practice, Whitney Kelting observes that while the Jinas are all theoretically interchangeable, her informants had clear preferences for stavans or
Ādinātha’s popularity reached such a fevered pitch as to not be ignored by more mainstream Hindu communities. In a model of assimilation similar to the Buddha, he was incorporated in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa as a minor incarnation of Viṣṇu (aṃśāvatāra). Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa participated in and contributed to the popularity of the Ādinātha cult during this period.

The basic plot of the Ādipurāṇa can be neatly divided into three sections: the ten earlier births of Ādinātha’s soul; his eleventh birth and renunciation as King Rśabha; and the ensuing fraternal contestation over Rśabha’s kingdom and the subsequent renunciation and liberation of all the main characters. At the end of forty-seven chapters, in which Jinasēna exhaustively details Ādinātha's births and rebirths, we arrive at his liberation:

Ādinātha wandered with his Gaṇadharas, meditating for a thousand years and fourteen days on thousands of Jain Pūrva texts, for the sake of the liberation of qualified people. Reaching Mount Kailāsa on the day of the full moon, in the month of Pauṣa, devoid of all desire, that man, sat down in the middle of the Śrīsiddha peak.

---


I generically refer to the soul of the last Tīrthāṅkara as Ādinātha except in the context of specific rebirths such as his eleventh and final birth as Rśabha. The eleven births of Ādinātha’s soul are: Jayavarmā, Mahābala, Lalitāṅga, Vajrajaṅgha, Arya Vajrajaṅgha, Śrīdhara, Suvidhi, Acyutēndra, Vajranābhi, Ahamindra, and Rśabha.

---

satāṃ satphalasaṃprāptyai viharan svagaṇaiḥ samaṃ |
caturdaśadinopetasasrābdonapūrvakaṃ || 47.322
lakṣaṃ kailāsamāsādya śrīsiddhaśikharāntare |
paurṇamāśidine pauṣe niricchaḥ samupāviśat || JĀP, 47.323
Here, liberation is rendered in a mere two verses. The brevity and quotidianness of Jinasēna’s language at this precise moment stands in stark contrast to the dense poetic description and enumerative quality that characterizes his text as a whole. Consider, as a counterpoint, two verses that describe the infant Ṛṣabha’s birth ceremonies:

The Lord’s beautiful appearance and natural luster
is decorated with ornaments
like a poet’s poem is tightly arranged with poetic ornaments.

With his every limb adorned with gems and jewels by Indrāni,
he appeared like a wish-fulfilling tree,
ornaments adorning every branch.²⁹⁶

Jinasēna’s poetic comparison of an ornamented baby to an ornamented poem is of a qualitatively different style to his documentary account of Ādinātha’s liberation.

Jinasēna’s economy of language at this moment in the text is particularly notable if we read liberation, the telos of the Jain tradition, as neatly mapping onto the literary aims of the Ādipurāṇa. As opposed to his poetic lingering over the body adorned, Jinasēna’s banal account of liberation suggests that the aims of the Ādipurāṇa are far more complex and require a more nuanced set of reading practices than a simple one to one correlation of religious and literary ends.

One way to begin to make sense of the banality of liberation is that in a cyclical understanding of time liberation has already always happened.²⁹⁷ Consider, for example,

²⁹⁶

²⁹⁷ Repetition around the lives of the Tīrthaṅkaras became such a standard and accepted aspect of the Jain narrative tradition that later theorists created vocabularies to describe particular types of repetition. For example, Sōmatilaka’s Saptatiṣatasthānaprakaraṇam (1330 C.E.) describes a system of one hundred and seventy sthānas, or slots, for the repetitions shared by all Tīrthaṅkaras. These slots contain what Brühn calls “filler,” that...
an early scene in the Ādipurāṇa from Ādinātha's second birth as King Mahābala. His minister Svayaṃbuddha visits a clairvoyant Jain sage (avadhijñāna) on Mount Mēru. He asks if King Mahābala is a bhavya, or a soul with liberatory potential. The sage replies that not only is Mahābala a bhavya, but, in a future birth, he will be born as the first Tīrthaṅkara of the current cycle of time. The figure of Indra too is important in this regard; at Ṛṣabha’s major life events he comes and performs a play entitled Ānanda that reenacts Ādinātha’s past lives. Through the persistent trope of the clairvoyant sage or the dancing Indra revealing forgotten pasts and futures to come, the text again and again pre-stages the entirety of the narrative for its reader. In response, the reader has no choice but to abandon any pretense of surprise because we already know the narrative and how it is unique information about the Tīrthaṅkara (i.e., the name of the Tīrthaṅkara's father), but that fundamentally fulfills the same role for all twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras (i.e., they all have a category of “father”). Klaus Brühn, “Repetition in Jaina Narrative Literature,” Indologica Taurinensia 11 (1983): 48-49.

A bhavya (literally, "to be about to be") is a technical term in Jainism that refers to a person whose soul will achieve liberation during a future birth. P. S. Jaini, “From Nigoda to Mokṣa: The Story of Marudevī,” in Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini, ed. Olle Qvarnström (Fremont: Asian Humanities Press, 2003), 16-17. Inversely, the tradition also allows for a set of souls that are abhavya, devoid of liberatory potential or forever and inescapably caught in the cycle of rebirth.

Trapped in the cycle of rebirth, a soul has either no knowledge of its prior births or unexplainable fragmentary memories or feelings that continue to shape the soul’s behavior and relationships in its current birth. Phyllis Granoff has pointed out both the religious and narrative importance of the act of recalling one’s former births (jāṭismara) or what she calls the “autobiographical encounter.” She says, “Autobiography in many of these stories was also not just author-centered; the listeners become the autobiographical subjects in their own right and autobiography became not just the account of a single life history, but the account of human kind.” Phyllis Granoff, “This Was My Life: Autobiographical Narrative and Renunciation in Medieval Jainism,” Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 75 (1994): 48. Within a Jain text there are any number of listeners and readers for whom autobiography has the potential to become biography. Typically within the text the central characters both listen to other people recall their lives, but they also receive accounts of their own lives from clairvoyant sages. At the same time, the autobiographies or biographies within the text have the potential to work on the text’s readers outside the text in the same way that they work on the characters listening within in the text.
will end (and how it will begin again). I contend that the scene between Swayambuddha and the sage, and similar ones repeatedly staged throughout the text, demonstrate how the Ādipurāṇa broadly dispenses with suspense, climax, and resolution—literary strategies that create a linear temporal reality within the text.\footnote{Larry McCrea comes to a very similar conclusion in the context of Kṛṣṇa and Śiśupāla’s transmigratory history in which Kṛṣṇa/Viṣṇu previously kills Śiśupāla in the form of the asura Hiraṇyakaśipu and in the form of Rāvana. Kṛṣṇa will inevitably kill Śiśupāla as he always already has done. About this, McCrea says, “The regularity, and therefore the predictability, of what is to be the climatic event of the poem—Kṛṣṇa’s killing of Śiśupāla—and the characters’ own awareness of this predictability, serve precisely to rule out any sense of suspense or dramatic tension that might otherwise attach to this event. The central plot of the poem acquires thereby a kind of artificial, scripted quality—it is the playing out of a known scenario to a known conclusion.” Larry McCrea, “The Conquest of Cool: Theology and Aesthetics in Māgha’s Śiśupālavadha,” \textit{in Innovations and Turning Points: Towards a History of Kāvya Literature}, eds. Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014), 128.} Instead, I suggest that the Ādipurāṇa enacts a cosmologically and ontologically structured understanding of time that is distinctly Jain.

Through its lengthy and repetitious emplotment of Ādinātha's cycles of birth, death, and rebirth along a continuum of moral development, the Ādipurāṇa mimetically mirrors the repetitions of transmigration (sāṃsāra). Sāṃsāra names a process in which human activity causes the accrual of karmic matter to binds to the soul that, in turn, determines the circumstances of its next rebirth. Only with the removal and cessation of karmic accrual does the soul exit the cycle of rebirth and achieve liberation. In what is neither a short nor easy process, a soul on this transmigratory journey experiences an often-endless number of rebirths (on earth, heaven, and hell) over a span of time that can stretch thousands and thousands of years. Even within the Jain community as a whole, the medieval Digambara community of the Deccan was distinctive for its scholastic interest
in *karma* and its calculations. Indeed, the entire extant scriptural corpus of the *Kaśyaprabhṛta* and the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* along with their extensive commentarial traditions are entirely focused on the workings of *karma*; for this Jain community, scripture is, in fact, the study of *karma*. Jīnasena’s *Ādipurāṇa* is a literary extension of this karmic preoccupation with the advantage that literature is capable of figuratively embodying a soul’s karmic trajectory.

The repetitions of Ādinātha’s rebirths serve as the *Ādipurāṇa*’s basic narrative structure, a structure that invites the reader to experience the breadth of a soul’s transmigration. The repetitions of the text rupture at the moment when Ādinātha’s soul achieves liberation. Yet, the text’s encounter with the fundamental goal of this religious tradition occasions a narratological problem. Jain liberation not only entails a freedom from the cycle of rebirth, but complete freedom from the affective and temporal patterns of human life. Liberation, then, is the precise point at which human life and so biographical narration becomes impossible. The insusceptibility of liberation to narration is reflected in the condensed and accelerated quality of Jīnasena’s account described above. He moves past it quickly, without ornamentation, because liberation is not a site of narrative possibility but one of narrative closure. The opening up of narrative lies in repetitions of *samsāra* itself as a structuring feature of the text, but also as the central literary strategy through which the *Ādipurāṇa* draws its reader’s attention to important features of the narrative in order to emphasize certain content over others.

Let’s take, for example, Ādinātha’s ninth birth as Vajranābhi, the son of King Vajrasena and Queen Śrīkāntā in the Eastern Vidēha country. Starting with his head and moving down to his toes, Jīnasena immediately directs the reader to Vajranābhi’s
beautiful lustrous body. We are also told of his training in royal knowledge (rājavidya) and mastery over all of the necessary arts and weaponry. King Vajrasēna recognizes his son’s inherent qualities of beauty and intellect and hands over control of the kingdom to him. With great pomp and circumstance, Vajranābhi is crowned king and his body is decorated with jewels and silks. With the kingdom stabilized, Vajrasēna takes Jain ascetic initiation (dīkṣa). Here we get a set of contrastive verses that compare the practice of kingship with the practice of asceticism. After Vajranābhi has successfully ruled the earth for a long time, he realizes that his kingdom is merely a piece of straw. He too hands over the kingdom to his own son and embarks down the path of renunciation. After a detailed account of his various ascetic practices, Vajranābhi dies in the eleventh of fourteen stages (guṇasthānas) that mark the soul’s progression towards liberation.\textsuperscript{301}

Through Ādinātha’s birth as King Vajranābhi, we are introduced to one set of repetitions that define his six incarnations in the world: repeated birth as a king.\textsuperscript{302} In each of these royal incarnations a further set of small-scale repetitions become apparent: the father’s renunciation to the son’s assumption, a phase of royal sumptuary or even erotic excess, epiphany regarding the futility of the kingdom and its renunciation, the crowning of an heir, and the embarkation on the path of asceticism. During this soul’s final incarnation as Ṛṣabha, these events are drawn out and extended before they culminate in the text’s final structural disruption, the renunciation of the text’s main characters. In dilating the narrative time before his liberation, the narrative focus of the text lingers on the experiences of Ādinātha’s soul in the world. And this is, as we have

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{301} \textit{JĀP}, vv. 11.8-11.111.
  \item \textsuperscript{302} His royal births are Jayavarmā, Mahābala, Vajrajaṅgha, Suvidhi, Vajranābhi, and Ṛṣabha.
\end{itemize}
seen, not just any world. It is a world filled with a cast of kingly characters caught up in the sensory and affective experiences of the medieval court, a world of sex, love, and intense attachments.

The centrality of the optic of the court persists beyond Ādinātha’s earthly royal births and also serves as the setting for his remaining five divine births. Indeed, in the Ādipurāṇa birth as a king and birth as a god are structured around the institutional and sumptuary experiences of the court. Take, for example, Ādinātha’s eighth birth as Acyutēndra, or the Indra in the Acyuta Heaven. Starting with his head and moving down to his toes, Jinasēna again directs the reader to Acyutēndra’s beautiful lustrous body—this time ornamented with a garland of blossoms from a wish-fulfilling tree. Acyutēndra enjoys all the material and sexual pleasures that heaven has to offer. Surrounded by forty thousand bodyguards and possessing an army of seven divisions, he rules three nested courts of increasing size. He has eight chief queens enthroned in their own respective courts. While enjoying this life of excess, the garland around his neck suddenly withers indicating the end of his life as a god. With six months remaining, Acyutēndra worships the Arhat and meditates on the five paramēṣthiṣ, or supreme beings.

Whether through birth as a king or birth a god, the repetitions of Ādinātha’s births and rebirths draw the reader into a vision of the world and of heaven structured around the image of a king ensconced in his court. The manifold descriptions of beautiful bodies bedecked in silk, engaged in passionate lovemaking, and relishing in the material excess
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303 His divine births are Aryan Vajrāṇa, Śrīdhara, Acyutēndra, and Ahamindra.
304 The gods in the Ādipurāṇa do not experience sickness or disease. Their death is mechanistically rendered through the withering of a garland or indicated by a yawn or sneeze.
305 JĀP, vv. 10.173-11.6.
of ghee, incense, and perfume reflect a vision of bodily and worldly sovereignty. The narrative encourages the reader to take it all in: at every possible moment, the Ādipurāṇa pauses to proliferate descriptive and didactic content. These descriptions serve to subordinate plot to a poetics of lingering—which after all, each birth as a king or god simply repeats a previously established set of repetitions (renunciation of the kingdom, etc...).

Through its accumulation of description and repetition, the genre of the Ādipurāṇa dilates narrative time. The genre unrelentingly inhabits this flattened temporal space, inviting the reader to linger and to experience time in the same way. This temporal dilation, as well as the lingering reading practice that it elicits, maps on to a specifically Jain ethical challenge of being in the world—that to renounce the world, one must go through it, experiencing it across many lifetimes. The genre of the Ādipurāṇa, then, poses a phenomenological question: how do we navigate the world at hand?

While premodern South Asia literature, broadly speaking, is invested in the king as literary hero, the king of the Ādipurāṇa is not simply a literary tropological necessity of elite genres invested in the reproduction and glorification of imperium. Rather, the king and the court are a synecdoche of the world reoriented toward liberation. I suggest that for the genre of the Ādipurāṇa, the figure of the king represents the epitome of worldliness, one constituted by heightened experience of and attunement to the world—of erotic love, of sensuous materialism, of political power—a world that against all expectations can and does lead to renunciation and liberation.306 Plainly put, it is through
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306 The Ādipurāṇa, and the Jain tradition more broadly, participates in the religio-political ideology of the Cakravartin, or the universal ruler who turns the wheel of law and/or the wheel of dharma. Unlike in Buddhism, the figure of the Cakravartin is typically disaggregated from the future Tīrthaṅkara and their roles are seen as largely separate. There are twelve Cakravartins in every cycle as well as twelve Tīrthaṅkaras. In our
the exaggerated subjectivity of a king ensconced in a court that the genre shows us the path through the world and out the other side. In Jinasēna's hands the heightened worldliness constitutive of the genre of the Ādipurāṇa—assembled through the figure of the king and the site of the court—neatly dovetails with his broader courtly and religious literary aspirations.

3. Theory of a Literary Genre; Or, Literary Genre as Theory

The Ādipurāṇa's generic investment in the king as a figure for a kind of Jain phenomenological investigation helps explain the particular Sanskritic generic ecology in which Jinasēna situates his poem. In the opening of the Ādipurāṇa, Jinasēna parses the names of familiar Sanskrit discursive genres as a means of explanation for how and why they apply to his text. He starts by describing his Ādipurāṇa as a "great ancient lore" by explicating the meaning of the compound mahāpurāṇa: "it is an ancient lore (purāṇa) because it relates to the past and it becomes great (mahā) through its narration by great people and from teaching the highest good."307 Jinasēna then explains that his text is also "history" by breaking down the word itihāsa into its constituent etymological parts (iti hā asīt) that gives it the meaning "it occurred here like this."308 Using a similar etymological approach, he shows how his text is derived from sages (ārṣa); finely rendered (sūkta); a current cycle of time the Tirthaṅkaras Śantinātha, Kunthunātha, and Aranātha are also Cakravartins.
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307 JĀP, vv. 1.21-22.
308 Ibid., v. 1.25. Mahāpurāṇa and itihāsa are not particularly unusual genres for Jinasēna to lay claim and, in fact, can refer to the same textual object. Moreover, these are the genres of the classical Sanskrit epics, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana that clearly exerted an influence over the form and content of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa. The most extensive piece of scholarship to date on Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa focuses on the text as a reworking of the Mahābhārata intended to reclaim the idea of the hero engaged in an internal rather than external battle. See Ralph Strohl, “The Image of the Hero in Jainism: Rṣabha, Bharata, and Bāhubalī in the Ādipurāṇa of Jinasēna” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1984), 25.
treatise on dharma (dharmaśāstra); a story with a plot (vṛtta); a form of traditional instruction (aitihya), and the highest scriptural authority (āmnāya, the Vēda).⁶⁰⁹ His generic claims are not only limited to formal narrative style and content; rather, his claims attempt to capture what such genres do and the status they are accorded. By accounting for his text in encyclopedic terms, Jinasēna poses the Ādipurāṇa as universal in scope and equivalent in status to the Vēdas.

Yet, of all the genres, styles, and qualities that Jinasēna liberally attributes to the Ādipurāṇa, he is most concerned with its status as aestheticized court poetry (kāvya). In an extended discussion of kāvya, he simultaneously demonstrates his familiarity with classical Sanskrit literary theory as well as his text’s own alignment with Sanskrit aesthetic norms.⁶¹⁰ He says, "Kāvya is produced from the knowledge of the poet's sentiment or activity; it has poetic ornaments, recognizable meaning, clarity, and refinement...Poetry is like the face of the Goddess Sarasvati—ornamented, emotionally expressive, inherently clever, and pure." However, for Jinasēna, the Ādipurāṇa is not simply kāvya, but mahākāvya, a great poem whose greatness derives from its extended length, thematic grandeur, and poetic superiority.⁶¹² In Jinasēna's view, for a poem to be considered a mahākāvya it must be connected with ancient history, relate to great heroes, and bind together the fruits of the trivarga (kāma, artha, and dharma).³¹³ Although not as comprehensive as the definitions found within theoretical texts, Jinasēna's descriptions of
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³⁰⁹ JĀP, vv. 1.24-1.25.
³¹⁰ Jinasēna even signals to his reader his awareness of debates within Sanskrit literary theory, such as to whether poetic beauty is derived from meaning or from poetic ornaments. He states that both opinions are acceptable. Ibid., v. 1.95.
³¹¹ Ibid., vv. 1.94 and 196.
³¹³ JĀP, v. 1.99.
kāvyā and mahākāvyā neatly align with Daṇḍin and other classical Sanskrit aestheticians.³¹⁴

Whether or not he directly identifies them in his formal definition, Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa does largely adhere to the norms of mahākāvyā, including: individual stanzaic composition, poetic devices, aestheticized emotions, linguistic complexity and variation, monumental descriptions (of cities, seasons, women, et. al.), exceptional length, a focus on forwarding the four aims of human pursuit, a marital thematic layered with romance, and, at its center, a heroic king. Jinasēna formally departs from typical mahākāvyā style in his exclusive use of ślōka as the carrying meter throughout the text. While Jinasēna does introduce metrical variation and more complex meters at the end of each chapter (as was the norm in mahākāvyā), his pervasive use of the ślōka meter is more typical of the older Sanskrit epics.³¹⁵ Furthermore, rather than mahākāvyā cantos (sargas), the Ādipurāṇa is divided into epic style chapters (parvans) that contain a vast range of sub-genres from lengthy religious discourses (śāstra), hymns (stōtras) that span the length of entire chapters, to sections that function as ritual manuals (vidhāna, kalpa).³¹⁶ Puzzling over the mixed quality of the Ādipurāṇa's poetry, Siegfried Lienhard notes, "A large part of it has unmistakably epic features, and even when the style and manner of presentation strongly resemble those of kāvyā, it is nevertheless closely related to narrative writing,

³¹⁴ For a comprehensive summary of traditional definitions of mahākāvyā see Gary Tubb, “The Kumārasamādhava in the Light of Indian Theories of the Mahākāvyā” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1979), 69-103; also see chapter two "The Poetics of Mahākāvyā" in Peterson, Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic, 7-20.

³¹⁵ As a counterpoint to the basic ślōka style of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa, see the list of carrying meters for each chapter in Bhāravi's Kirāṭārjunīya, Ibid., 236, fn. 46.

³¹⁶ The sarga is such a constitutive feature of mahākāvyā that the genre is also known as a construction of cantos (sargabandha). Siegfried Lienhard, A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984), 161.
epic literature, the *purāṇas* and the *māhātmyas*. Jinasēna's formal poetic aims are artfully enacted within his text—and, indeed, the *Ādipurāṇa* is frequently singled out as one of the most beautiful examples of Jain poetry—but, at the same time, it also bears the traces of other generic modes and styles.  

If Jinasēna clearly demonstrates his conversance with classical Sanskrit *kāvya* and his intention to write in that style, then he also bursts open traditional understandings of what *mahākāvya* is and does by subsuming under it a multiplicity of generic claims (*purāṇa, itihāsa, dharmaśāstra*, etc.). It is unusual for one single text to self-consciously inhabit the combination of all these genres. As Indira Peterson notes:

> *Mahākāvyas* need to be contrasted with other kinds of discursive texts as well and especially from texts in the category *śāstra* (technical treatises) and *itihāsa-purāṇa* (heroic and mythic narratives). The former primarily teach, the latter primarily tell a story, usually in order to help the reader/listener to gain spiritual benefits (*phala*). Court epics may tell a story and may impart moral values in doing so, but their primary function is to adorn and beautify, and thus render auspicious, the persons and milieu that they celebrate.

From the perspective of standard generic understandings, Jinasēna's *Ādipurāṇa* brings together in one text a set of genres (and attendant content) that are normally seen as doing very different discursive work. Through the *Ādipurāṇa*, Jinasēna demonstrates that technical moral discourse, mythological narration, scriptural authority, and poetry are not discrete textual—or even intellectual—enterprises, but can and should exist within the
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317 Ibid., 212.
319 While earlier aestheticians defined *kāvya* as a genre distinct from *purāṇa/itihasa*, Ānandavardhana’s extensive use of examples from the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyana* in the *Dhvanyāloka* blurred the lines of these genres for later writers. Tubb, “The *Kumārasaṃbhava* in the Light of Indian Theories of the *Mahākāvya*,” 14.
320 Peterson, *Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic*, 10. For distinctions between traditional Sanskrit genres also see Tubb, “The *Kumārasaṃbhava* in the Light of Indian Theories of the *Mahākāvya*,” 7.
same frame. For Jinasēna, that frame is mahākāvya.

For the Jains, much like the Buddhists, literary narrative became the site through which Jain identity and practice was imaginatively enacted. By writing kāvya and mahākāvya, Jain authors starting with Jinasēna were able to circulate their religious narrative literature within the environment of the court and within a broader social imaginary bound together by Sanskrit and Sanskrit aesthetics. Indira Peterson has observed, "Even though the two earliest extant mahākāvyas (the Buddhacarita and the Saundarananda) treat Buddhist themes and were written by a Buddhist poet (Aśvaghoṣa, circa 1st century A.D) the [mahākāvya] formula has had such a normative force in the literary context that Buddhist and Jaina poets have turned it to their own advantage by using it subversively." What Peterson describes here bears further unpacking to understand the literary culture in which Jinasēna, and other Jain poets, were writing. For all the available discourse within the Sanskrit literary tradition on imagination (pratibhā), the broader medieval courtly culture of which it was apart was largely imitative. While Daud Ali has productively drawn our attention to the shared ethos and culture that constituted such elite practice, less attention has been paid to the modes of derivation and imitation that enabled such sharing across discursive, material, and religious domains. To be imaginative was not a matter of working outside established literary boundaries, but a way of working within them in a way that was fresh and new. Thus, to be taken seriously within the Sanskrit literary sphere meant medieval Jain poets had to come to
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322 Peterson, *Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic*, 9-10.
terms with kāvyā, to command the language of the gods in the world of men for the purpose of disengaging from the world itself.

What kind of poem, then, is Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa, if it both adheres to the formal features of mahākāvya while simultaneously—and quite self-consciously—expanding its scope? To begin to answer this question requires laying out the literary and political stakes of writing kāvyā and, in particular, mahākāvya. One feature that all mahākāvyas share is an undeniable investment in and perpetuation of an idealized vision of kingship and courtly life. And, as John Cort has stated, "in medieval India, discourse on kingship was political discourse." Moreover, as Sheldon Pollock has aptly shown, Sanskrit kāvyā specifically was an important tool for the expression of political power. To write mahākāvya was to write in the medieval courtly genre par excellence and to participate in a discourse on kings and kingship and the glorification thereof. With such mundane investments, mahākāvya has been traditionally understood to be a profoundly secular literary endeavor although at least in the case of Buddhist and Jain kāvyā the religious objectives are largely unmistakable. On one level, the expansion in content and scope that Jinasēna marks through his generic claims reflects his larger attempt to transform mahākāvya into an avenue for Jain religious narrative and, at the same time, to make Jain narrative an appropriate topic for court poetry. But, on another, perhaps less apparent level, by rendering the religious narrative of the Ādipurāṇa in the style of a
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324 Peterson, Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic, 11; Pollock, The Language of the Gods in the World of Men, 148; and David Smith, Ratnākara’s Haravijaya: An Introduction to the Sanskrit Court Epic (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1985), 56.
325 John E. Cort, “‘Who is a King’? Jain Narratives of Kingship in Medieval Western India,” in Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History, ed. John E. Cort (Albany: New York State University Press, 1998), 86.
327 On the secular nature of kāvyā see Ibid., 89 and 448.
courtly mahākāvya, Jinasēna affected a formal union of courtly and religious domains. The subversive quality of Jain mahākāvya—that Peterson gestured to in the quote above—is in the ways that Jinasēna commingled worldly and other worldly concerns in both the form and content. The resulting poem is one that sees religion and politics, kingship and renunciation, and pleasure and dispassion as deeply interconnected.

These interconnections can be hard to see, due, in particular, to reigning aestheticist approaches to Sanskrit poetry. Sanskrit poetics has clear expectations of what makes good and bad poetry, its proper content and form, and the effects/affects that it should produce (the specifics of which are sites of open debate). For both poets in the past and scholars in the present, these aesthetic expectations coalesce at the micro level of the stanza and the macro level of the genre. In shuttling between genre and stanza, however, this form of textual engagement risks losing sight of the text itself—as an intricate tapestry of aesthetic techniques, imaginative figuration, ideological and religious commitments, and theoretical conceptualization. Indeed, to read for the ways in which Jinasēna reworks the genre of mahākāvya necessitates comprehending textuality as irreducible to either generic belonging or technical composition. Without abandoning the productive heuristic of Sanskrit poetics, I begin to think here about the work that the Ādipurāṇa does outside of and across genres.

To say that particular discursive modes and genres become fundamentally fused to specific projects (intellectual, political, religious or otherwise) hardly seems like a point worth making. Although the details of such fusion—the how, when, why—remain elusive in the context of premodern South Asia and are often based far more on
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328 Ibid., 431.
assumption than actual evidence. Nevertheless, the consequences of this fusion overburdens genre as an explanatory paradigm for intellectual investment (or disinterest). Consider, for example, Sheldon Pollock's assertion that in premodern South Asia "[t]here was no specifically Śaiva or Vaishnava political practices, no specifically Jain political philosophy...no specifically Mahāyana theory of political power." Underlying these claims is a presupposition about genre: to engage the political is to theorize it explicitly in a discursive form immediately legible as philosophical, a-religious, and, ideally, in Sanskrit. Or, alternatively, as he argues elsewhere, we can access the political through aestheticized political power found in secular Sanskrit kāvya. Jain authors are left out on both counts: apart from a few examples (Sōmadēvasuri's Nītivākyāmṛta and the Laghavarhanīti attributed to Hēmacandra), there is no tradition of writing technical treatises on Jain political philosophy, nor did Jains regularly engage in writing "secular" kāvya. Are we simply to assume that Jainism, because it does not approach the political similarly, does not concern itself with power or politics? In generic terms, are we to believe that political texts do not make religious claims and that religious texts like Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa do not make political claims? The short answer is no.

While maintaining the object of the text, literary scholarship—under various guises such as in the work of Dominic LaCapra or even Mary Poovey—has opened up the possibility that the work of a text can be disaggregated from the conceptual

330 Ibid., 89.
331 The Deccani Jains are, of course, the great anomaly in this regard. As least two Kannada Jain poets, Pampa and Ranna, wrote, in Pollock’s terms, seemingly “secular” kāvyas based on the *Mahābhārata*.
frameworks that their generic affiliations seem to solicit.\textsuperscript{332} That is, there is a dissonance between the expectations that we bring to texts and the work that texts actually did (or could do), within the historically specific generic, discursive, and epistemological ecologies from which they emerged. What I want to suggest here is that Jinasēṇa, in attempting to theorize a Jain perspective on kingship, turned not to the genre of scientific political treatise, but to the Ādipurāṇa as mahākāvya. In doing so, he brought together the Ādipurāṇa, a genre of Jain literature invested in kingship as the pinnacle of worldliness, and mahākāvya, the courtly genre most associated with the ideological reproduction of kingship and courtly culture more broadly. In so doing, Jinasēṇa’s Ādipurāṇa transformed mahākāvya, the idiom of the court, into a vehicle for Jain narrative material and vice versa. And by offering a vision of kingship in which the king renounces, the Ādipurāṇa theorized changes to the court itself. Put plainly, to intervene into the aestheticized representation of the court, to turn it on its head, was to intervene in the reproduction of the court itself. Bound together in Jinasēṇa’s poetry, the Ādipurāṇa as mahākāvya became a site through which to produce, project, and reflect novel religious and political arrangements. It was through literature and not political theory that Jinasēṇa imagined an ideal union of religious and political worlds, worlds beyond the scope and capacity of formal philosophical and theoretical discourse.

5. The Ambivalence of Jain Kingship

If, as I have suggested here, Jinasēṇa sought to intervene in the ideology and

\textsuperscript{332} See for example, LaCapra’s comments on the work-like quality of registers of inquisition, Dominick LaCapra, “Rethinking Intellectual History and Reading Texts,” in \textit{History and Theory}, 19. 3 (1980): 250; and really the entire volume of Mary Poovey, \textit{Genres of the Credit Economy: Mediating Value in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-century Britain} (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008).
practice of kingship and theorize it from a Jain perspective, a new question emerges:

Who are these Jain kings? In the only piece of scholarship that directly addresses kingship in the Ādipurāṇa, Paul Dundas suggests that we “view South Indian kingship as an institution which transcended conceptual boundaries such as Jainism or Hinduism.”

And, to an extent, the kings of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa are simply that, kings. They rule by the classical political tenets of persuasion (sāma), liberality (dāna), violence (daṇḍa), and dissension (bhēda), perform the ritual conquering of the directions (digvijaya), and even engage in vegitilized hōma sacrifices at their coronations. Martial violence inherent in the expansion of an empire goes largely unthematized (although unnecessary violence is certainly not encouraged). Indeed, one could say that the behavior and practices of these kings would not be out of place in the classic Hindu epics. More often than not, our notions of medieval kingship derive not from the practices of rule, but from the epitomization of the experience of courtly culture narrated in texts like the Ādipurāṇa. On this count as well, Jinasēna's kings move through a world filled with love, sex, and sumptuary excess that neatly aligns with non-Jain depictions of courtly life. What is it, then, that makes these kings Jain?

Stated in the opening salvos of the text and repeated throughout, we are told again and again that kingship itself is the fruit of Jain dharma, that kingship is the product of Jain religious practice and belief.

One who is desirous of dharma is desirous of everything.
One who is desirous of dharma possesses the happiness of wealth.
Indeed, dharma is the basis of the achievement of all wealth, success, and happiness.
Dharma is a wish-fulfilling cow.

---

Dharma is a mighty wish-fulfilling gemstone.
Dharma is an everlasting wish-fulfilling tree.
And dharma is an eternal treasure.
Behold the greatness of dharma that guards against calamity!
The gods from afar cannot violate man who is abiding in it.
Oh! Intelligent one! Interiority, the status of a king, fame in the world,
the experience of the self, and the obtainment of supreme knowledge
are achieved through the inconceivable greatness of dharma.
Dharma prevents man’s calamity
and confers an elevated status and perpetually increasing happiness.
The meaning of the purāṇa is dharma.  

Counter to its common depiction as a religion with an austere ascetic focus and extreme
otherworldly orientation, the image of Jainism described here is of a religion whose
practice leads to great worldly benefits including happiness, status, and every conceivable
desire be that material or spiritual. This equation of dharma and worldly success is
reiterated throughout the text in various formulations, such as: “Dharma guards against

\[
\text{dharmārthī sarvākārthī dharmārthī dhanasaukhyayān | dharma hi mūlaṃ sarvāsāṃ dhanardhisukhasampradāṃ || 2.33} \\
dharmaḥ kāmadudhā dhenudharmacaśāntānāṃ | dharmā kalpataḥ stheyān dharma hi nidhirakṣayaḥ || 2.34 \\
pāṣa dharmasya māhātmyaṃ yo apāyāpāparakṣaṭi | yatra sthitāṃ naraṃ dūrātānātmakāmān devatāḥ || 2.35 \\
vicāranpalokāmadityaprayatayo api ca | dhīman dharmasya māhātmyaṃ nirvicāramavehi bhoḥ || 2.36 \\
sa dharma vinipātebhyo yasmāt saṃdhārayennam | dhatte cābhuydayasthāne nirapāyasukhodaye || 2.37 \\
sac a dharmaḥ purāṇārthaḥ purāṇāṃ pañcadhā viduḥ | kṣetraṃ kālaśca tīrtham ca satpurāṇastadviceṣṭitam || JĀP, 2.38
\]

334 Consider, for example, Sinclair Stevenson’s statement that, “Like Buddhism and
Brāhmanism, Jainism might be defined as a ‘way of escape’ not from death but from life;
but unlike either of them, it hopes to escape into nothingness nor into absorption, but into
a state of being without qualities, emotions, or relations, and removed from the possibility
of rebirth. Sinclair Stevenson, The Heart of Jainism (London: Oxford University Press,
1915), 89-90. Written in 1915, it is stunning how such a picture of Jainism continues to
endure despite the best efforts of Jain Studies to complicate it. See, for example, John E.
Cort, Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India (New York, Oxford
misfortune. *Dharma* yields the desired fruit. *Dharma* is conducive to happiness in the life to come and through *dharma* there is happiness in this world.\(^{336}\) In this perfected world only accessible through *dharma*, kingship functions as the pinnacle of social and political hierarchy and pleasurable excess in a civilization described by Ronald Davidson as one “whose medieval expression is a concern for (and sometimes obsession with) status, hierarchy, political power, religious authority, and personal indulgence.”\(^{337}\) Jinasēṇa is even more specific in binding Jain *dharma* to kingship broadly conceived: “Through *dharma* alone, one can become a king of gods, a king of men, or king of the monastic assembly. Through *dharma*, one can become a Tīrthaṅkara or even achieve supreme liberation.”\(^{338}\) As we will see below, kingship serves as an imperial metaphor through which to figure the increasing sovereignty of a soul along a continuum of moral development. The scenario described in this verse neatly tracks the trajectory of Ādinātha’s soul on its transmigratory journey as a king of men, king of gods, and, finally, as a Tīrthaṅkara.

The identifiable proto-Protestant quality of these verses, one that links proper religious conduct to material and social success, has not been lost upon the field.\(^{339}\) Max Weber himself made the connection between Jainism and Protestantism in his *Die Wirtschaftethik der Weltreligionen, Hinduismus und Buddhismus* (1916), later translated

---

\(^{336}\) *JĀP*, v. 42.116.


\(^{338}\) *JĀP*, v. 10.108.

into English as *The Religion of India* (1958). However, as Lawrence Babb notes, there is “no evidence that Jainism generates anything resembling the intense soteriological anxiety that, according to Weber, drove Protestant economic behavior.” Instead, in Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa*, we find the inverse: the accumulation of worldly well-being *itself* generates a deep anxiety and ambivalence. If we think back to the repetitious features of the plot described above we are confronted with a text that, on the one hand, is deeply concerned about the attainment and maintenance of kingship (and, by extension, happiness, wealth, and sexual pleasure) and, on the other, its renunciation. This ambivalence makes possible extremely contradictory perspectives on kingship within the same text. Jinasēna writes, for instance, “Therefore, having known the fruit of *dharma* by all the signs such as the kingdom, and so on… Those desirous of those things should focus their mental activity on the illustrious *dharma*.” But, alas, the reader already knows that “The kingdom is exceedingly dangerous like a poisonous flower that steals the breath. And, it is extremely frightening like the abiding glance of the evil eye.” Within Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa*, the kingdom is simultaneously a boon of moral behavior and a poisonous flower to be discarded. This tension between the desire to be in the world through the heightened worldliness offered up by kingship and the kingdom and the impulse to renounce becomes a predominate theme that Jinasēna’s grapples with in his *Ādipurāṇa*.

4.1. The Lakṣmi of Kingship versus the Lakṣmi of Liberation

---

342 *JĀP*, v. 5.24.
343 Ibid., v. 4.142.
The ambiguity of Jain discourse on kingship and renunciation is most visibly expressed through Jinasēna’s deployment of the trope of the Goddess Lakṣmi or Śri, the female personification of fortune, prosperity, and success. The unsteadiness or fickleness of Lakṣmi—commonly expressed through the adjectives of lōla or cañjala—is a well-known trope for the plight of kingship, and, therefore, a critique of politics. Lakṣmi, as the simultaneous embodiment of both prosperity and sovereignty, quite naturally became associated with kingship from a very early period and became a popular figurative trope in both the literature and epigraphy of the medieval Deccan. Lakṣmi is first depicted in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (c. 8th B.C.E.) as desirous of and wedded to a powerful king. More broadly, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa also provides the narrative foundation for fickleness as a defining feature of Lakṣmi’s persona and, by extension, kingship itself—associations that would persist in classical and medieval literature and transcend religious and sectarian affiliation and religious boundaries. For the first time in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, we get a sense of Lakṣmi as a force that generates sovereignty, prosperity, and so on, and, just as quickly, takes it away. The mere

344 Following Jinasēna’s usage, I use Lakṣmi and Śri interchangeably.
346 Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 2. 4. 4. 6 as cited by Jan Gonda, *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), 46.
347 The text details how Prajāpati, the Vedic deity associated with creation, produced the beautify Śri from the Mitravindā sacrifice. The cast of Vedic deities present became infatuated with her and pilfered her virtues: "Agni then took her food, Soma her royal power, Varuṇa her universal sovereignty, Mitra her noble rank, Indra her power, Brhaspati her holy luster, Śāvirī her dominion, Pūṣana her wealth, Sarasvatī her prosperity, and Tvaṣṭṛ her beautiful form." Lakṣmi promptly responds by performing a sacrifice of her own to retrieve her stolen virtues from each of the gods. Julius Eggeling, ed., *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900) 63, vv. 11.4.3.3-11.4.3.18.
invocation of Lakṣmi then signals broader discussions of kingship and sovereignty.

If the unsteadiness of Lakṣmi personified a certain understanding of the state of kingship, then the task of the medieval South India king was to stabilize Lakṣmi. In Hindu mythology, Viṣṇu is the sole god able to achieve this task. As narrated in the Padma Purāṇa, Lakṣmi is the final item to emerge from the famous churning of the ocean of milk. After being worshipped by all the gods, she marries Viṣṇu. Tracy Pintchman's reading of this scene highlights the cosmological stakes of this divine marriage: namely, "...Vishnu's sovereignty and ability to stabilize Shri-Lakshmi are of overriding importance and illustrate Vishnu's role as protector and maintainer of the earth."³⁴⁸ Viṣṇu as the master of Lakṣmi—visually and literarily depicted by Lakṣmi residing on Viṣṇu's chest—can be read as the culmination of what it means to be both a king and a god. The nascent Vaiṣṇava political theology implicit in this formulation made Viṣṇu an appealing model for kings. By the eighth century, Vaiṣṇavism, and to a lesser extent Śaivism, displaced Buddhism as the operative lens through which imperial kingship and power was conceived.³⁴⁹ The pervasiveness of Vaiṣṇavism as the language of political self-expression permeated the inscriptive and literary culture of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.³⁵⁰ Consider, for example, the two possible readings of the second verse of the Sañjan plates of Amōghavarṣa (871 C.E):

May Viṣṇu in the form of Vīranārāyaṇa himself protect you here, who is all-

³⁴⁸ Tracy Pintchman, *Guests at God’s Wedding: Celebrating Kartik Among the Women of Benares* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 48. For a good summary of the story of the churning of the ocean of milk as told in the fourth khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa in English see pages 46-49 in this volume.
³⁴⁹ As Ronald Inden has shown, prior to the eighth century, Buddhism was the imperial optic through which kings imagined sovereignty. *Imagining India* (London: C. Hurst, 1998), 67.
³⁵⁰ Ibid., 234.
pervading, who rests on the hood of [the serpent] Ananta, who is the rising mountain of valor, character, and greatness, and the progenitor of the lofty line of the good Rāṣṭrakūṭas.\textsuperscript{351}

May Amōghavarṣa, that Vīranārāyaṇa, himself protect you here, who is powerful, who lives in endless enjoyments, who is the rising mountain of valor, character, and greatness, and the ancestor of whose lofty line was the good Rāṣṭrakūṭas.\textsuperscript{352}

This single verse generates two possible readings by playing upon the name and attributes of Viṣṇu as Vīranārāyaṇa and the use of that same name as an epithet of King Amōghavarṣa.\textsuperscript{353} In praising Viṣṇu and Amōghavarṣa as one, the verse completely equates the two, collapsing the spheres of Amōghavarṣa’s mundane power and Viṣṇu’s spiritual power.

The political resonance of the pairing Viṣṇu and Lakṣmi—whose union symbolizes the stabilization of a kingdom—is also explicitly apparent is contemporary Rāṣṭrakūṭa literary materials that work within a Vaiṣṇava political-theological framework. For example, Śrīvijaya's \textit{Kavirājamārgam} opens with:

\begin{quote}
Śrī is encircled as if by a screen of light
born from the kaustubha jewel
situated upon the chest of King Nṛpatuṅga,
the endless source of justice, the compassionate.
Because of her love, she does not leave him.\textsuperscript{354}
\end{quote}

Here again, King Amōghavarṣa is imagined through the classic image of Viṣṇu with the \textit{kaustubha} jewel and Goddess Śrī Lakṣmi on his chest. The evocative line "because of her love, she does not leave him" plays upon Lakṣmi’s role as the bride of powerful kings

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{352} Ibid. Retranslated from Bhandarkar.
\textsuperscript{353} Inden says about the Vīranārāyaṇ manifestation of Viṣṇu that he “descends in the form of a gigantic boar, Varāha, to rescue the Earth…” \textit{Imagining India}, 215.
\textsuperscript{354} śrī taḷṭuradol kaustubhajātadyuti bhalasi kāṇḍapaṭadantire sam-\
prītiyin ā avanan agal nītinirantarān udāran ā nṛpatuṅgan || \textit{KRM}, 1.1 {kanda}
\end{footnotes}
who, as such, is romantically desirous of Amōghavarṣa. At the same time, Lakṣmi's devotion to Amōghavarṣa signals the stability of Amōghavarṣa's sovereignty: namely, sovereignty expressed through the trope of Lakṣmi who will not leave him. This image of Viṣṇu as paramount god-king with Lakṣmi residing on his chest was so potent that it became delaminated from a specifically Vaiṣṇava context. While the mediums of literature and epigraphy at times depict incongruous discursive worlds, this was not the case with the metaphoric valence of Lakṣmi: quite literally wedded to the figure of the king and seated on his chest, she moves seamlessly across multiple discursive mediums following her beloved wherever he went. Inhabiting this Vaiṣṇava imagery, the kings of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa are also frequently described as having chests that are "the abode of Śrī Lakṣmi." While Jinasēna liberally borrows from this type of established Vaiṣṇava political ideology, Jinasēna puts to use the familiar figure of Lakṣmi for decidedly Jain ends.

Lakṣmi frequently appears in Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa as Rājyalakṣmi (“Lakṣmi of the kingdom), Rājalakṣmi (Lakṣmi of the king), Jayalakṣmi (Lakṣmi of victory), Vijayalakṣmi (Lakṣmi of Triumph), and Vīralakṣmi (Lakṣmi of heroism), compounds that invoke her political connotations previously established in the earliest strata of Vedic commentarial literature and expanded upon in Vaiṣṇava mythology. However, Jinasēna also deploys the political force of Lakṣmi to animate other physical and conceptual spaces. She takes on an increasing specifying force throughout the text through her various guises as: Tapōlakṣmi (Lakṣmi of asceticism), Vanalakṣmi (Lakṣmi of the forest),

---

355 *JĀP*, v. 15.19; also see verses 6.23, 6.50, 6.199 and 30.127, for similar imagery.
Mokṣalakṣmi (Lakṣmi of liberation), and Muktilakṣmi (Lakṣmi of emancipation).  

Most notable among Jinasēna’s many invocations are the ways in which Lakṣmi is used to figure the worldly sphere of kinship (the king, the kingdom, victory, triumph, heroism,) and the spiritual world of Jain religious practice (asceticism, the forest as the site of ascetic activity, liberation, and emancipation). And it is through the trope of Lakṣmi that Jinasēna most potently brings these spheres into conversation. For example, consider this scene drawn from Ādinātha’s ninth birth as King Vajranābhi, previously summarized above. Vajranābhi’s royal assumption—as with all of Ādinātha’s royal incarnations—is precipitated by his father Vajrasēna’s renunciation of the throne and initiation into Jain ascetic practice. The father and son set off on the seemingly opposed paths of asceticism and kingship that Jinasēna here brings together through the figure of Lakṣmi.

At the time of his renunciation, Indra appropriately worshipped Vajrasēna, the delight of Lakṣmi of liberation [Muktilakṣmi]. In a mango grove garden, bowing down in a multitude of thousands the kings received Jain initiation at the same time as Vajrasēna. Vajranābhi kept the kingdom free from thorns while the King of the Yōgis performed spotless asceticism. Vajranābhi experienced pleasure from the embrace of Lakṣmi of the kingdom [Rājyalakṣmi] while the Guru was delighted by his commitment to Lakṣmi of asceticism [Tapōlakṣmi]. Vajranābhi possessed the support of his brothers. The most excellent Yōgi possessed the lasting support of his virtues. With his courtiers, King Vajranābhi ruled other kings. With the austerity of yōga, the King of the Sages nourished virtuous people. The son was residing in his own abode of the kingdom.

Jinasēna is not alone in this regard. The medieval inscriptive culture of the region also attests to Lakṣmi co-optation to increasingly specified political realms. For example, in EC Vol. 5 Hassan, no. 65 we find Lakṣmi of the Hoysaḷa Kingdom (poysalarājyalakṣmi) and in EC Vol. 3, Sp, no. 11 and Mv, no. 121 we find Lakṣmi of Karnataka (karnatakakalakṣmi).
The guru was residing in the final abode. These two were intensely focused on the well-being of others and the protection of the people of the realm.

A shining weapon appeared in Vajranābhi’s armory of victory. A lustrous weapon of meditation appeared in Yōgi’s armory-like mind. With this weapon, the lord of the world conquered the entire world while the sage achieved greatness in the three worlds through his victory over karma.

Those two appeared victorious as if they were engaged in mutual competition. But, the victory of one was short lived and the victory of the other overcame the entire world.357

In this set of verses, the activities of King Vajranābhi are contrasted with those of the ascetic Vajrasēna—quite literally the two are depicted in competition with each other.

Through the technique of formal poetic twinning, Jinasēna here draws kingship and asceticism into adjacent, but hierarchically structured spheres of activity through their respective embrace of the Lakṣmi of the kingdom and of asceticism, the support of the brothers and of moral virtue, the assistance of courtiers versus yōga, residence in the kingdom as opposed to the final abode, and the weapon of war in contrast to the weapon

357 yathocitāmacitiṃ tanvatsūttamanākiṣu |
parimāśkrayya cakre asau muktalakṣmī pramodiniṃ || 11.47
samaṇ bhagavatānena sahasraśraniṣkramitāḥ |
mahatyāmravanodyāne nṛpāḥ prāvājiśustādā || 11.48
rājyaṃ niṣkantākṛtyā vajranābhirapālayat |
bhagavāṇa pīya yogindrastapascakre vikalmaṇaṃ || 11.49
rājyalakṣmīpariśvaṅgad vajranābhistutoṣa saḥ |
tapolakṣmīsamāsaṅgad gururasyātipipriye || 11.50
bhrāṭbhrīrdhrīraśyāṣid vajranābhe samāhitaḥ |
punaiṣtu dhṛtamātene yōga śreyo anubandhibhiḥ || 11.51
vajranābhinirpo amātyai saṃvidhatte sma rājakaṃ |
munindro api tapoyogairgṝmamapaśayat || 11.52
nije rājyēśrāme putro guruṁantyāśrame sthitāḥ |
parārthhabaddhakṣṣyau taṃ pālayāmāsatuḥ praṣāḥ || 11.53
vajranābherjahayāgāre cakraṃ bhāṣvaramudvabhaḥ |
yōginī api manogāre dhūnacakraṃ sphuraddyutiḥ || 11.54
tato vyajeṣṭa niśsesām mahīmeṣa mahīpatiḥ |
muniḥ karmajayāvātpatmāhā jagatāṭrayāṃ || 11.55
spardhamānavānyonyamityāṣṭāṃ tau jayoddhurau |
kintvekasya javo atyalapāḥ parasya bhuvanātiṣaḥ || JĀP, 11.56
of meditation. The formal parallelism that charges these verses comes to crisis at the point of the extent of these realms: Vajranābhi’s imperial power is momentary and limited to this world, whereas Vajrasēna ascetic power is eternal and extends across the three worlds.

While maintaining proximity between them, Jinasēna further elevates asceticism over kingship by playing upon the unstable quality of Lakṣmi as a metaphor for the instability of the kingdom, beauty, age, and wealth. The moment of epiphany—when the Ādipurāṇa’s kings realize the fickleness of Lakṣmi and the broader futility of the world—is a central factor that prompts these kings to renounce their kingdoms. Here, what makes kingship distinctly Jain are not necessarily the practices that kingship entails, but the experiences of kingship that lead to a realization of its transience that then prompts renunciation. As Ādinātha pointedly tells his younger sons who are fighting with his eldest son Bharata over control of the kingdom, "The kingdom is ephemeral and he too will eventually abandon it."358 The issue of whether one will renounce their kingdom is a question of when and not if. The text makes this connection between the ephemerality of kingship and renunciation—again, often through the trope of Lakṣmi—most explicit in the moments of realization that precipitate renunciation. For example, King Vajrabāhu, the father of Ādinātha's fourth incarnation Vajrajaṅgha, observes the dissipation of a palace shaped cloud.

Then, on another day, standing on the terrace of his palace, the great and lustrous King Vajrabāhu reflected upon a rising autumnal cloud. Within the span of a single moment, he observed its dissolution into a mass of clouds.

358
His affect went to extreme indifference and he was burdened by heavy thoughts. Having beheld this sight, he thought, “How did I see this autumn cloud in the shape of a palace and, within a second, it was gone? Just like that, our riches can disappear in a moment. Volatile Lakṣmi, the embodiment of wealth and youth, is like a flash of lightening. Beauty and pleasure are only momentary and cause pain in the end. Age drips away every second like a leaky water pipe.359
Upon the realization that his kingship and kingdom are no more enduring than a castle built out of clouds, Vajrabāhu renounces everything. Or consider a similar moment that artfully reflects upon the nature of kingship: King Vajradanta is presented with a flower by his gardener. He leans in to inhale the fragrance and is confronted with the sight of a dead bee nestled within the blossom. The parallelism that the image evokes—of the king and the bee in lusty pursuit of pleasure—demonstrates the futility, and perhaps even the danger, of the sumptuary indulgences of royal life. And yet, the king would not have renounced had he not leaned in, desirous of lingering over the flower’s scent. If Jinasēna’s characters ultimately negate worldliness, this negation is earned by kings who embrace the world—all of it—as only kings can.

6. Out of the Mouths of Kings: Jinasēna’s Definitions of Kingship

359

athānyedyurmahārājo vajrabāhurmahādyutiḥ |
śaradambudharotthānaṃ saudhāgrastho nirūpayan || 8.50
dṛṣṭvā tatvilayaṃ sadyo nirvedaṃ paramāgataḥ |
viraktasyāsyā cīte abhūditi cintā gaṛīyasī || 8.51
paśya naḥ paśyatāmeva kathameṣa śaradghanaḥ |
prāsādākṛtirudbhūto vilīnaśca kṣaṇāntare || 8.52
sampadabhravilāyaṃ nah kṣaṇādesāṃ vilāsyate |
lakṣmīstaḍidviloleyaṃ itvartho yauvanaśriyaḥ || 8.53
āpātamātraramyāśca bhogāḥ paryantatāpinaḥ |
pratikṣaṇaḥ galatyāyurgalannālijalam yathā || JĀP, 8.54

For similar imagery, see JĀP, vv. 4.142-4.150 and vv. 8.61-8.79.
A deeply ingrained conservatism pulses through medieval Digambara thinking and Jinasēna is no exception. In pursuit of royal patronage and influence, Deccani Digambara Jains do not appear to have been particularly interested in overturning the political system writ large. Instead, Jinasēna and poets like him incorporated the experiences, structures, and practices of extant forms of medieval kingship and subverted them to their own ends. Through beautiful Sanskrit court poetry, Jinasēna assembles a vision of kingship as a position born of meritorious activity in a previous life, the experience of which leads to renunciation. What made a Jain king had little to do with the practice of kingship itself, but in the experience of kingship as engendering renunciation. Jinasēna’s poetry captures the aesthetically saturated world of kings and then plays with the very language and experience of kingship to describe renunciation. The play of his language has a poetic force that palpably renders the connection between kingship and renunciation as adjacent, but hierarchical spheres of human experience; a true king is a liberated soul. As previously noted above, Jinasēna’s understanding of the scope of mahākāvya was not limited to poetry itself. Unsurprisingly, then, Jinasēna mobilizes multiple complementary generic modes to theorize kingship. If kāvya was the site through which to imaginatively enact a Jain vision of kingship, then śāstric discourse was the site through which to translate the experiences of the Ādipurāṇa’s kings into axiomatic thought. Placed in the mouths’ of kings holding forth in their courts, such elements of discourse occur naturally within the narrative. The kings of the Ādipurāṇa formally define kingship for the reader.

After Ādinātha renounces his kingdom, his eldest son Bharata is crowned king
and immediately undertakes the ritual conquering of the directions (*digvijaya*). With this central act of kingship accomplished, he returns to Ayodhya in a state of existential angst. What is his place in the world and how could his position best be put to use? He first creates the brāhmaṇa caste, a group comprised of the most meritorious Jains. He then discourses on various subjects to the court including caste obligations and life stages. He describes a soul’s life stage called “the renunciation of Indra” (*indratyāgya*) in which the God Indra renounces heavenly pleasures and is reborn as a human on the path to liberation. This human enters a phase called “crown prince” (*yauvarājya*) and then a phase called “sovereignty” (*sāmrājya*) in which he becomes a king (these sages are clearly marked in the text as “*iti sāmrājyaṃ*” and so on). Finally, Bharata begins to explain the practice of kingship itself:

There are two rules: subjugate the wicked and guard the noble. The eternal *kṣatriya dharma* is to be protected by the lord of the people. The gods bearing divine weapons are to be wisely worshipped according to established precepts. With their favor, victory becomes certain. At the same time, by protecting the conduct of kings without any negligence, he dwells among the people on the path of justice. Following this *dharma*, he can become the victor of *dharma*. Soul conquered and engaged in a proper livelihood, the *kṣatriya* can triumph over the earth. In this life, he can obtain fame, possess the earth, and maintain prosperity. In the next, he can obtain prosperity and subdue the three worlds in succession. Thus, he repeatedly instructs them all in the modes of protection.

---

360 Inden notes that, “The annual holding of court, preceded by a ‘ceremonial bath’ (abhisheka) and followed by a royal progress (which might turn into a extended military campaign) was the act that reconstituted or reproduced the ruling class of a polity as a self-ruling society.” Inden, *Imagining India*, 229. This very much accords with the activities of the kings of the *Ādipurāṇa* who are repeatedly anointed by *abhiseka* and who embark on world conquering military campaigns.
361 *JĀP*, Parva Thirty-Eight.
363 Ibid, v. 38.213.
By meditating on ṣrṣa and kṣēma, he protects himself and all of this. Therefore, his empire is, indeed, just and filled with activity. With his protection, it flourishes in this life and in the next. He protects the people and the guardians of the people in this manner for a long time. With consciousness arising at that time and place, he should undertake renunciation. The assembled class of gods repeatedly explains that when he feels dispassion for his kingdom, he should desire the act of Jain initiation. With other kings as witnesses, he entrusts the acquired kingdom to his oldest son. He then instructs him on the protection of the people. “Oh, son! You must become a wealth of justice for the maintenance of the people. Under just rule, the people are regarded as a wish-fulfilling cow that fulfills all desire. You must understand that the conduct of a king entails the judicious accumulation of wealth through cultivation, protection, and bestowal upon sacred sites. For the sake of the protection of the people, he should protect his wisdom and convictions. Wisdom is the knowledge of good and bad in this world and in the next. Therefore, you are able to accumulate wisdom through the control of the senses, the company of elders, and the knowledge of the dharma and arthaśāstras. Otherwise, a king is ignorant of justice and injustice. He would be overpowered by others possessing false knowledge. He is obligated to perform a great amount of effort to protect his family. Without knowledge of the family’s dharma, he corrupts them with his bad conduct. Thus, he should always perform a vast amount of effort to protect himself. Only when he is protected can all others be protected by the king. The unprotected soul of the king is destroyed by enemies and is dishonored by his own servants’ anger and greed. Therefore, he should keep away evil and anything connected to the enemy, those who devour fiery juices. He should guard himself from his intimate companions and through action. The king too should exist in a state of justice. If a king guards himself through unjust conduct, he is overcome by his own people. His justice should be respected as impartial to the people. Harshness characterized by speech, the rod, and so on should be merciful. Therefore, his own conduct, which conquered a set of misfortunes, protects all of this. The king, firmly established in his own kingdom, delights in the present life and in the life yet to come. The king should treat every member of the community equally, guard the self, and defend the people. The conduct of the king is thus described. Protecting the kṣatriya dharma in this manner, you obtain fame, dharma, and victory while abiding in the kingdom. Thus, a calm mind and arising consciousness ruled him. At the auspicious event of renunciation, he was honored by the chiefs of the gods. Then having given great charities and giving up his position within the empire,
that king of kings, the royal sage, exited the house to the forest.365
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Bharata begins with the familiar directives that a king’s central role is to protect (pālana) the people (prajā) and that victory occurs only through dharma. There is nothing uniquely Jain about these directives. In fact, this is yet another instance in which Jinasēṇa’s theorization of kingship borrows from the established norm envisioned as kṣatriya kingship. However, in short shrift, Jinasēṇa imbues this vision with a decidedly Jain flavor. Kingship takes on a transmigratory quality; the kingdom and its benefits such as prosperity endure in this life and in the next. After the king performs such protection “for a long time” (cira), he develops a consciousness (utpannabodha) that leads him to take Jain ascetic initiation. The king hands over the kingdom to his eldest son, only after ensuring that he too is educated in the proper conduct of kings (rājavṛtti). After making donations and giving up the kingdom, the king of kings (rājarāja)—now transformed into a royal sage (rājarṣi)—goes to the forest.

Before a king can retire to the forest, the not so small matter of the kingdom remains. Bharata’s speech and the Ādipurāṇa’s kings exhibit an intense anxiety over the stability of the kingdom after the king’s renunciation. As seen through both of these poetic and śāstric textual modes, the kingdom’s renunciation is only possible once the kingdom’s future is secured. We see the kingdom once again as a deeply ambivalent space to be enjoyed and renounced, but also maintained. For example, the anxiety over
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the kingdom’s future becomes thematized in Ādinātha’s fourth birth as Vajrajaṅgha. Vajrajaṅgha’s father-in-law desires to renounce his kingdom, but none of his sons will accept the throne. They very rightly point out that if the kingdom is to be renounced then there is no motivation to accept it in the first place. After casting around amongst his sons, Vajradanta crowns his infant grandson Puṇḍarīka as king because only a baby cannot refuse to such a beauteous burden. The crowning of an infant king is the logical extreme of Bharata’s thinking in which the kingdom must be secured above and beyond the commencement of austerities. At the moment of royal renunciation, the Jain perspective is deeply invested in both the mundane political order and the otherworldly order of liberation. Despite the anxiety that royal renunciation engenders in the Ādipurāṇa’s characters, Jinasēna’s prescription of crowning an heir beforehand serves as a stabilizing mechanism for the kingdom itself. If we consider the broader political context in which Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa was written, the death of a king—sudden or otherwise—was a moment of great vulnerability; royal succession was frequently contested among sons or even by other branches of the royal family and a kingdom in such disarray was susceptible to attack or even takeover by competing dynasties. A carefully timed late-in-life royal renunciation cancels out such vulnerability and stabilizes the kingdom at a fraught moment of political transition.

The vision of kingship that Bharata puts forward neatly aligns with the figure of the king that occurs in each karmic cycle of Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa. This formal definition of kingship casts the position in a distinct temporality that is reflected in the broader narrative as well; kingship is to be renounced at the end of one’s life. Both in Bharata’s

---

366 Ibid., vv. 8.64-84.
definition and enacted in the lives of the Ādipurāṇa’s kings it is only after kingship is practiced and its fruits fully experienced that one develops a renunciatory subjectivity. This epitomizes my observation about the conservativism of Deccani Digambara Jain thought with which this section began. Jinasēna’s theory of kingship subverts the very experiences of kingship as precipitating renunciation, but this changes only the trajectory of kingship and not the actual institution. Put slightly differently, Jain kingship and kingship more broadly appear largely the same. However, routed through a Jain perspective the experience of kingship itself ultimately and inevitably leads to renunciation. If Jains conservatively theorized kingship within what was a brāhamaṇical framework then the resulting notion of kingship had quite profound effects in shaping the Jain religion.

This distinct temporality of Jain kingship appears again in another one of Bharata’s śāstric discourses. In chapter forty-two he begins a soliloquy on kṣatriya dharma. Embedded within this is an intensification of his previous comments upon kingship. He says,

\[
\text{Therefore, this kingdom is to be abandoned like an unhealthy medicine, but austerities are to be accepted by wise people like eating healthy food. Thus, having become detached from the beginning, a wise man should abandon the pleasure of the kingdom. In case he is unable to renounce in that manner, the insignia of kingship should be abandoned at the very end of his life.}^{368}
\]

The vision of kingship that pervades the Ādipurāṇa in all of its generic multiplicity is made explicit here. Jinasēna, through the character Bharata, posits an ideal-typical—

\[
\text{\begin{verbatim}
368
$t\text{ato rājyamidaṃ heyamapathyamiva bheṣajam |}$
$\text{upādeyaṃ tu vidvadbhistapaḥ pathyamivāśnaṃ || 42.121}$
$\text{iti prāgeva nirvīda rāiye bhogaṃ tyajet sudhīḥ |}$
$\text{tathā tyaktumaśakto ante tyajed rājyaparicchadaṃ || 42.122}$
\end{verbatim}}
\]
albeit implausible—scenario in which kingship is renounced immediately. In thinking characteristic of the śāstras, there is always another more realistic option; kingship could and should be renounced at the end of one’s life. Here the text tells the reader what we have already come to know through the preceding forty-one chapters; each and every one of the kings of the Ādipurāṇa follows this same trajectory of end of life renunciation that Bharata explicates here. The question then becomes: what does the formal śāstric mode of explication do for the reader? How does Jinasēna’s poetic vision of kingship relate to his more formal definitions?

Jinasēna’s more śāstric-style definitions of kingship work to summarize the larger theoretical work of his Ādipurāṇa. Bharata’s different register of speech quite literally translates the accumulated poetic imagery—of the instability of Lakṣmi, the leaky pipe, the poisonous flower—into formal theoretical discourse. We might imagine, in this moment, Jinasēna winking at his audience as if to say, “Here it is again in plain language, in case you didn’t get it the first time.” Jinasēna’s multiplicity of discursive styles work upon the reader differently or even upon different readers differently. By this I mean we experience and take in information disparately depending on the format, be it prose versus meter or sung versus spoken. Poetry versus theoretical discourse is no different. Bound together through Jinasēna’s larger generic framework of mahākāvya, these two discursive modes mutually work to reinforce Jinasēna’s larger vision of Jain kingship. The reader comes to know through multiple reading experiences that kingship is something to be inhabited and then renounced. However, it is only through poetry that Jinasēna specifies why kingship should, in the end, be abandoned. It is only in poetry that
we can see the erotic and sumptuary excess of the court come to life thereby leading the
king on the path of renunciation.

The optic of Jain kingship—and, in particular, this chapter’s argument that
kingship itself became a path to renunciation—illuminates larger ongoing debates on
renunciation within Jainism and in South Asian religions more broadly. The Jain side of
this debate is neatly captured through the figures of Ādinātha and Mahāvīra, the first and
last Tīrthaṅkaras. The Digambaras believe that Ādinātha was an exemplary householder
who married, had children, and, ultimately, renounced the world in old age. In contrast,
they believe that Mahāvīra remained celibate and disinclined towards worldly affairs
throughout his entire life.\textsuperscript{369} Bookending the tradition, these Tīrthaṅkaras represent quite
radically different visions of a life well lived and the place of renunciation within it. As
reflected in Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa, Ādinātha’s life is perhaps best understood as a Jain
assimilation of worldly life into a renunciatory trajectory. On the other hand, Mahāvīra’s
innate renunciatory impulse is deeply antinomian, and potentially even societally
destabilizing. P.S. Jaini notes at length,

It has earlier been noted that all eleven of the original disciples of Mahāvīra were of
the brahman caste, also that they entered his order together with hundreds of their
students. This kind of large-scale movement of young people into the monastic life
must have had a tremendous effect upon the society of the time; several lectures of the
Uttarādhyayana (for example, x, Nemipraṇayā; xiv, Isukārīya; xx, Mahānirgranthiya; xxi, Samudrapāliyā; xxii, Rathanemīyā) attest to the
presence of a widely felt uneasiness among householders in the face of such a
phenomenon. Renunciation of the world was ordinarily not considered appropriate
until an individual had fulfilled his societal duties and reached a fairly advanced age;
those who violated this norm to follow Mahāvīra must have done so despite
tremendous familial and societal pressures to ‘enjoy worldly pleasures first.’\textsuperscript{370}

\textsuperscript{369} Jaini, \textit{The Jaina Path of Purification}, 11. Also of note, the Śvētambaras believe that
Mahāvīra was an exemplary householder with both a wife and a daughter. In this sect,
Mahāvīra also delayed renunciation until his parents had both died.

\textsuperscript{370} Ibid., 67.
Jaini’s quote captures the concern of early Jain sources over the possible destabilizing effect of youth renunciation en masse. Ādinātha and Mahāvīra represent two distinct paths to renunciation; the former rather than the latter was deemed preferable. Again, this is a largely conservative position that did not challenge societal norms or expectations, but rather illuminates the ways in which Jains assimilated worldly life and made it functional for Jain practice.

If Jains had to creatively theorize ways to assimilate worldly life, the classical brāhmaṇical tradition was faced with the challenge of assimilating renunciatory life that was very much counter to the traditional Vedic householder’s obligations to marry, to procreate, and to discharge debts.371 Even when accepted as a form of practice, the proper time for renunciation remained a point of controversy among brahman communities.372 For example, Yādavaprakāśa’s *Yatidharmasamuccaya* (11th c.) expands upon two possible renunciatory trajectories. On the one hand, one could fulfill their brāhmaṇical obligations of marriage, procreation, and debt discharge and then renounce. Or, on the other hand, one could renounce at any time “as long as a person is detached from worldly things.”373 These two paths to renunciation neatly parallel similar debates going on in the Jain community through the figures of Ādinātha and Mahāvīra. While the *Yādavaprakāśa* ultimately endorses the later option of renunciation at any time, the debate continued to

---


372 Wendy Doniger notes in her introduction to the *Kāmasūtra* that debates over the proper age to engage in sexual love (*kāma*) reflected or satirized similar debates over the proper time to engage in renunciation. Wendy Doniger and Sudhir Kakar, trans. *Vastyayana Kamasutra* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), xiv.

play out in epic literature, which captures brāhmaṇical ideals in a similar way that the Ādipurāṇa renders an ideal Jain world. Coming from two very different perspectives, these literary expressions of religious traditions ultimately come to the same conclusion: renunciation is a practice for the end of life. Olivelle describes the absorption of this temporality in epic literature,

Abdication in old age and the consequent retirement of the old king to the wilderness are considered central features of the royal ethic. The Rāmāyaṇa (2.20.21) states that the custom of a king abdicating in old age in favor of his son and retiring to the wilderness was established by ancient royal seers. The Mahābhārata (3.186.2-3) likewise says that Kalki Viṣṇuyaśas, the first king of the Kṛta age, started this practice, which has been followed ever since. The epics contain numerous accounts of famous kings who followed that custom. The only death suitable for a royal person is death either in the battlefield or in the forest (MBh 15.8.12).374

The examples that Olivelle gives could be endlessly proliferated.375 The vision of kingship expressed in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata agree with the Ādipurāṇa genre that the proper time for a king’s renunciation is at the end of life. However, the practices and rationale that prompt a king’s renunciation in Jainism versus brāhmaṇical Hinduism are notably quite different. In Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa, royal renunciation is not just a dictum to be followed because it is the established path for political stability or a required phase of life. Rather, Jinasēna is interested in the affective, corporeal, and sensory qualities of kingship, the experience of which serves to cultivate dispassion and, by extension, renunciation.

Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa establishes a Jain vision of kingship as a path to renunciation through a variety of discursive modes. The formal śāstric mode placed in the mouths of the Ādipurāṇa’s kings works to make explicit what is rendered in poetry. A

375 For example, see Charles Dreknier, Kingship and Community in Early India (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), 139.
king should guard the people and the proper conduct of kings (rājyavṛtti). When the desire for renunciation arises at the end of life, the king must crown an heir to ensure the continuity of the kingdom. However, within Jain narrative literature the Ādipurāṇa is just one articulation of the path to renunciation. The biography of the last Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra provides an alternative vision in which dispassion is always present and, thus, does not need to be cultivated at all. The internal Jain debate over the appropriate time for renunciation reflects a broader religious debate at this moment. Brāhmaṇical communities were also grappling with the proper relationship between worldly life and renunciation. Through the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata read alongside the Ādipurāṇa we see points of contact and continuity of thinking across a continuum of South Asian religions. Therefore, we can read Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa as actively intervening into the larger question of what it meant to be a king and the proper practices of kingship.

7. Conclusion: (Mis)Reception

Like all texts, Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa assumes a reader equipped with the necessary skills that the text demands. In this case, a reader well versed in the genre and poetics of Sanskrit mahākāvya, one sympathetic to or, at least, willing to inhabit a specifically Jain understanding of the soul that complexly structures the narrative, and one that can artfully move between his poetic imagery and śāstric injunctions. In this period of the Deccan, one does not have to look far for such an audience. As previously noted, Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa is undoubtedly a product of the dense Jain literary milieu associated with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court of Amōghavarṣa. From mathematics to poetry, the wide range of Jain Sanskrit texts produced in Amōghavarṣa's court attest to its receptivity to Jainism. Indeed, one could posit that Jinasēna’s ideal reader was likely King Amōghavarṣa
himself if not his court. Ralph Strohl notes on the issue of Jinasēna’s readership that, “Jinasena's scholarship and facility with Sanskrit, the predominant linguistic medium in which he wrote, suggest that his primary audiences must have been the Jaina monastic community and the royal court.” Strohl is quite right that Jinasēna attempts to assemble an elite readerly community drawn from the overlapping spheres of the royal court and Jain monastic and elite lay members. Indeed, this chapter argues that Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa attempts to unify the interests of these two readerly communities through a Jain vision of kingship in which the worldly is made functional for the spiritual and the spiritual is made functional for the worldly. That is to say, kingship leads to renunciation, but kingship is also a reward for meritorious religious activity in the world.

Any discussion of literary audience entails a consideration of the textual effects intended for such an audience. As this chapter has established, Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa written in mahākāvya style, sought both to portray and reflect a courtly world—typified by its cast of kingly characters—but, also, to intervene into the representation of such a world. By positioning the spheres of kingship and renunciation as inexorably bound the Ādipurāṇa posits that an ideal king is one who, through the practices and experiences of kingship, gives up his kingdom. However, in practice, the theoretical imperative to give up one's kingdom was undoubtedly a hard sell to the contemporary kings of the Deccan. And, yet, from the epigraphical record with which this chapter began such practices may have, in fact, taken hold, albeit in a limited fashion. We have several more inscriptions, peculiar to the medieval Deccan, that celebrate renunciant kings and their ritual death by the practice of sallēkhanā. Beyond the empirical fact of royal renunciation, Jinasēna is

extremely cautious in what he advances as the practices of kingship. The kingdom is to be enjoyed and then renounced, but it must also be preserved through an heir. Moreover, the kingdom cannot be abandoned at just any moment, but only in old age when its pleasures have been fully realized.

There are broader traces of the courtly influence that Jinasäna's Ādipurāṇa exerted beyond just the sphere of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court and the lithic records of royal renunciation. For example, the twelfth-century Tamil poet Cēkkiḻar’s Periyapurāṇam famously incorporated the Jain structure of the sixty-three great heroes into the Śaiva Nāyaṉmār tradition. Umāpati's Cēkkiḻārpurāṇam, a hagiographical account of Cēkkiḻar's life, describes how he composed the Periyapurāṇam to supplant his patron's enthusiasm for a Tamil Jain text called the Cintāmaṇi or Cīvakacintāmaṇi.377 The tenth-century Cīvakacintāmaṇi narrates the popular Jain story of the life and times of Jīvandhara, a story first found in Guṇabhadra's Uttarapurāṇa.378 While certainly a beautiful and sophisticated piece of Jain Tamil poetry, the Cīvakacintāmaṇi does not narrate the sixty-three Jain heroes that the Periyapurāṇam specifically models itself upon. The title Periyapurāṇam is even a direct Tamil translation of the Jain Sanskrit mahāpurāṇa genre.379 As such, several scholars have speculated that the text Cēkkiḻar intended to rival was one of the Jain mahāpurāṇas. Indira Peterson has suggested that the mahāpurāṇa in question was likely Cāvuṇḍarāya's Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣapurāṇam.380 This attribution

378 Ibid., 127-128.
380 Ibid.
seems highly unlikely, given that Cāvuṇḍarāya's text is written at a transitional moment in Jain Kannada literature away from the literary and aesthetic pretext of the court (the focus of my fourth chapter). Most commonly referred to as the first Kannada prose text, Cāvuṇḍarāya largely lifts verbatim the prose portions of older campū kāvyas (mixed verse and prose poetry)—such as Pampa's Ādipurāṇam and Ajitasēna's Ajitapurāṇam—with little emendation and combines them with his own writing. Cāvuṇḍarāya's amalgamating literary technique meant that the metrical portions of those earlier texts fell away, rendering the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣapurāṇaṃ narratologically incomplete. It seems far more likely that Cēkkiḻar's model was Jinasēna and Guṇabhadra's jointly composed Mahāpurāṇa—a full narration of the sixty-three heroes of the Jain tradition in beautiful and sophisticated courtly Sanskrit kāvya. This raises an important question: why was a Jain mahāpurāṇa such a source of interest to a medieval Tamil king and equally a source of consternation to a Śaiva court poet? One can only guess. However, if we consider the reading of Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa offered in this chapter then the mahāpurāṇa, and, in particular, its first and longest chapter the Ādipurāṇa, was a politically potent genre. Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa was the culmination of a set of discursive practices through which Jains authors and poets imagined and modeled a Jain world for Amōghavarṣa’s court—a world, it should be noted, that had no room for the Śaivas.381

Heralded by a shift from Sanskrit to Kannada that also began in Amōghavarṣa's court, the elite Sanskritic world that the Ādipurāṇa imagined and in which the text

381 The mahāpurāṇa as an object of competition and a site of political potency was reduplicated in twelfth-century Gujarat. The Śvētāmbara poet scholar Hēmacandra composed his Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita at a moment of Jain consolidation of the Caulukya court. Analogous to Cēkkiḻar’s Śaiva Periyapurāṇam, Hemacandra's Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita is thought to be a Śvētāmbara response to the popular the Digambara mahāpurāṇa tradition of Jinasēna and Guṇabhadra. Ibid.
circulated began to dissolve almost as quickly as it began. As the following chapters will demonstrate, in the ninth and tenth centuries, the vast majority of authors that populated Deccani courts were Jain—in fact, one is hard-pressed to name a poet from this period who was not Jain.\footnote{The dominance of Jain authors is reflected in the standard tripartite periodization of the history of Kannada literature by Indian and Orientalist scholars into Jain, Vīraśaiva, and Mādhva phases. This periodization is discussed more fulsomely in the next chapter.} At the same time, during this period of Jain literary effervescence, there is simply no record of Jain literature produced outside the medieval court complex. This bounded relationship that Jains maintained to the various Deccani courts is succinctly captured by D.R. Nagaraja’s observation that, "the unity between institutions of state and religious power was striking."\footnote{D.R. Nagaraj, "Tension in Kannada Literary Culture," in \textit{Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia}, ed. Sheldon Pollock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 326.} The Jain effervescence of the preceding centuries serves to highlight the radical literary and linguistic disjuncture of the twelfth-century Vīraśaiva movement. With the Vīraśaivas, we see for the first time a religious community in the Deccan actively—or, at least rhetorically—reject imperial patronage, elite language, and \textit{kāvya} in favor of a devotional literature written in \textit{ragaḷe} (blank verse) or \textit{vacana} (prose poem) in an accessible linguistic register.\footnote{In the Indian historiographical tradition, the shift from the Jain to Vīraśaiva literary phases also brings about a shift from Old Kannada (\textit{haḷagannaḍa}) to Middle or Medieval Kannada (\textit{naḍugannaḍa}).} Despite positioning themselves outside the courtly sphere, Vīraśaiva poets and Vīraśaivism quickly came into vogue in the courts. While Jains continued to actively contribute to Kannada literary culture they were largely dislodged from their earlier proximity to political power. This all too brief history of religious turnover in the Kannada-speaking region highlights the ways in which Jinasēna's \textit{Ādipurāṇa} anticipates and invites a Jain attuned courtly...
audience who had largely ceased to exist by the twelfth century.

A text that invites an audience who no longer exists is susceptible to readings and receptions that inevitably splinter its larger literary and theoretical goals. For the Ādipurāṇa, this entailed a transformation from courtly poetry with attendant political aspirations and interventions into scripture. Given the fleetingness of the Jain Sanskrit moment within Amōghavārṣa's court, it is perhaps unsurprising that this shift from poetry to scripture happened quite early. The Digambara secondary canon is comprised of four sections called anuyōgas (expositions), which are also known as the Caturavēda (the Four Vēdas). The first section called the Prathamānuyōga (the First Exposition) incorporated narrative literature exclusively in Sanskrit in an ongoing process that likely concluded in the tenth or eleventh century. The primary texts of this section of the anuyōgas include Raviśēṇa's Padmapurāṇa (676 C.E.), Jinasēna I's Harivamśapurāṇa (783 C.E.), Jinasēna II's Ādipurāṇa (c. 860 C.E.), and Guṇabhadra's Uttarapurāṇa (897 C.E.). Through the formation of this post-canon, Jinasēna's Ādipurāṇa was formally elevated to the level of scripture. In the contemporary Deccan, Digambara Jain practitioners continue to relate to the text as sacred, often placing Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa or his jointly composed Mahāpurāṇa in temples next to the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama and the

385 Although, as von Glasenapp notes, "The number of works belonging to the individual group does not appear to be exact: in fact, some titles figure constantly in all enumerations; since all these originated before 900 it could be presumed that the secondary canon was first proposed around this period." Helmut von Glasenapp & S. B. Shrotri, Jainism: An Indian Religious of Salvation (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999), 124.
386 Fleet describes a interesting anecdote about K.B. Patthak attempts to get access to a manuscript of the mahapurāṇa: "The MS., which is on palm-leaves, belongs to the Jain Svāmi of Kōlhāpur, and is worshipped and held in such veneration by him that Mr. Pāṭhak was not allowed to read the Praśasti for himself, but had to write it down from dictation." J.F. Fleet, “Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions: No. CXXVII,” IA 12 (1883): 216.
Any trace of Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa as a poetic work written for kings and about kings is gone. Instead, just as Jinasēna was remembered as an institutionally significant figure for Digambara Jainism in the Deccan, so too is his magnum opus consigned to an equivalent position of religious institutional importance and with it, kingship as a path to renunciation faded away as a Jain political innovation.

Nagarajiah notes that the "Mahapurana, a holy classic for ceremonial reading, is recited at festivals and special occasions in Jain shrines and public places. It is quite common to find Mahapurana, either in Sanskrit or in other languages, text tied into a cloth, sitting on Jaina puja altars in Jaina sanctuaries, monasteries and houses." Hampa Nagarajaith, *A History of the Rāṣṭakūṭas of Malkhēḍ and Jainism*, 65. H.V. Nagaraja Rao and Shubhachandra Jain also stated in my personal conversations with them that the text of Jinasēna and Guṇabhadra’s *Mahāpurāṇa* is used to predict a person’s future. With the text lying on its spine, the individual sticks a needle into the pages and the section the needle pricks are used to foretell the future.

387 Nagarajiah notes that the "Mahapurana, a holy classic for ceremonial reading, is recited at festivals and special occasions in Jain shrines and public places. It is quite common to find Mahapurana, either in Sanskrit or in other languages, text tied into a cloth, sitting on Jaina puja altars in Jaina sanctuaries, monasteries and houses." Hampa Nagarajaith, *A History of the Rāṣṭakūṭas of Malkhēḍ and Jainism*, 65. H.V. Nagaraja Rao and Shubhachandra Jain also stated in my personal conversations with them that the text of Jinasēna and Guṇabhadra’s *Mahāpurāṇa* is used to predict a person’s future. With the text lying on its spine, the individual sticks a needle into the pages and the section the needle pricks are used to foretell the future.
CHAPTER 4

Transmigratory Love Stories in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ: Caught in a Bad Romance?

1. Introduction

Pampa, the first poet of Kannada literature, picks up on Jinasēna’s proposition that the heightened sensorium of kingship leads to liberation in his tenth-century Kannada rendition of the Ādipurāṇa narrative. However, Pampa intensifies this quality of Jinasēna’s poetry through a focus on binding affective ties, stressing the emotion of love and romance pervasive in the world of the royal court. Through a poetic attunement to affect, Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ reveals the workings of a distinctive Jain emotional ontology. Although outside the purview of formal philosophical theorization, the Jain tradition views emotion as a kind of materiality that adheres to a soul over many lifetimes. For Pampa, then, love is never a singular event of a human life, but an experience that accumulates through cycles of transmigration. While the emotion of love remains stable, its worldly expression ranges from the erotic and paternal to the devotional. By tracing the experience of a transmigratory romance between the narrative’s main characters, I argue that Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ proposes a connection between erotic love and religious devotion mediated through the figure of the king and the site of the court. In Pampa’s hands, love is not something in which souls are caught, but is instead imbued with liberatory potential.

In the process, this chapter considers how the Kannada poet Pampa translated and transformed Jinasēna's Sanskrit mahākāvya into a Kannada campū kāvya (poetry comprised of mixed prose and verse). The questions that drive this chapter are: what are the changes that occur between Pampa and Jinasēna’s texts? How do we account for both
literary and aesthetic change as well as continuity? What does Pampa’s poetic elaboration of emotion do to the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa? What is the place of love and emotion in medieval Deccani Digambara Jainism? To answer these questions, I begin with a comparative reading of Ṛṣabha’s renunciation in Jinasēna and Pampa’s Ādipurāṇas. This textual juxtaposition reveals Pampa’s indifference to religious instruction and his far greater investment in exploring the sumptuary and emotional world of the court. However, his excising of didacticism does not excise religion itself, but rather produces a very real transformation of Jainism as an object that beautifies and can itself be beautiful. I then turn to the karmically driven transmigratory romance between the God Lalitāṅga (Ādinātha’s third birth) and his divine consort Svayaṃprabhe. This section considers how Pampa focuses, in particular, on the affect of love. As Daud Ali and others have shown, kings are persistently represented as romantically entangled figures within premodern South Asian literary and epigraphic culture.388 To this point, David Shulman notes, “so overwhelmed is the monarch by female attention and demands that it is a wonder he finds time for anything else in his life—if indeed he does!” 389 Whitney Cox points out that, “A king’s erotic vigor is often understood to be emblematic of royal power more generally.” 390 For Pampa much like for Jinasēna, the figure of the king becomes a central optic through which to understand the place of human intimacy, sexuality, and affective attachment within the austere and ascetic emphasis of Jainism. However, while the object

389 Ibid., 305.
of the court and the king remains central, the poets’ handling of these topics diverges.

This chapter ultimately argues that through a poetic emphasis on a distinctly Jain emotional ontology, Pampa proposes that the pursuit and attachment of love is related to the affective tonalities of both renunciation and liberation. The bond of love can serve to correctly orient the soul on the Jain path.

2. Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ: Same Narrative, Different Poetic Sensibility

If Pampa is the inaugural poet of Kannada literature then his Ādipurāṇaṃ is its inaugural literary text. His choice of the Ādipurāṇa narrative is significant in light of Jinasēna’s earlier Sanskrit version, composed approximately a hundred years earlier, which Pampa acknowledges as a source of inspiration. As we have seen, Jinasēna was the first Jain author to write the life of a Jina in Sanskrit and, in so doing, he transformed the biography of Ādinātha and the other Jinas into appropriate topics for court poetry, while also producing a text that simultaneously functioned as scripture. Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam is simply inconceivable without this earlier example. He follows Jinasēna’s version closely, adhering to his plotting and, at times, even his poetic imagery. I am by no means the first to note the close relationship between Pampa and Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇas. R.S. Mugali says, (referring to Pampa’s text as the Ādipurāṇaṃ and Jinasēna’s text as the Pūrvapurāṇa),

Pampa has followed this source closely in respect of the story and order of narration. And yet Ādipurāṇaṃ has its own original stamp. Both of them are Jaina purāṇas and both of them are poetic in character. But in Ādipurāṇaṃ, the poet’s approach predominates over the mythological. Pūrvapurāṇa is a poem in verse, whereas

---

391 PĀP, v. 1.35 {kanda}. I mark all meters from Pampa’s campū kāvyas in braces after the verse.
392 Jinasēna was not the first Jain author to write literature in Sanskrit. That honor belongs to Punnāṭa Jinasēna also known as Jinasēna II who wrote a Sanskrit Harivamsāpurāṇa in 783 C.E.
Ādipurāṇaṃ is a work in champu form. The form is over elaborate, the latter is relatively condensed. Pampa has amply justified his claim that one should look for religion and poetic charm together in his Ādipurāṇaṃ. Occasionally the diction gets Sanskrit ridden. But the poet has tried to blend religion and poetry in the manipulation of incidents and character portraiture.393

This close intertextuality between Jinasēna and Pampa’s Ādipurāṇas is a productive site to consider vernacularization in practice. What happens when a text is written in Sanskrit and then emulated and reworked in a vernacular language? Is this translation, rewriting, or something else entirely?

When comparing Jinasēna and Pampa’s texts what is immediately apparent is their difference in length. While it is difficult to quantify this difference given their distinct poetic genres (one in metrical kāvyā and the other in mixed prose and meter campū kāvya), it is still fair to say that Pampa’s version is substantially the shorter of the two. As Mugali observed above, a notable feature of Pampa’s text is his contraction, or editing down, of Jinasēna’s more expansive version of events. At the same time, in moments of sumptuary excess and emotional intensity Pampa expands on Jinasēna’s brevity. These literary strategies of contraction and expansion are neither arbitrary nor ubiquitous. Rather, Pampa systematically disburdens the Ādipurāṇaṃ of any extra-poetic material; for example, gone are Jinasēna’s lengthy didactic explanations of Jain philosophy—in particular, ontology and soteriology. Concurrently, Pampa produces new poetic possibilities through the expansive side-glances of beautiful women, the rhythmic quality of their dance, and their longing-in-separation from their lovers. Despite writing the same narrative, Jinasēna and Pampa’s literary aims are, to all appearances, incongruous. As previously noted, Jinasēna approaches kāvya as a literary framework

that could encompass a variety of other genres including technical moral discourse, mythological narration, and scriptural authority. Whereas Pampa’s campū, following a more typical courtly kāvya model, seeks to celebrate and render auspicious Ādinātha through beautiful poetry as an act of religious devotion (bhakti). 394 Indeed, Pampa is quite clear on this count, saying, “With unlimited devotion, I will compose this famous Ādipurāṇaṃ.” (ī negaldādipurāṇamman aparimitabhaktiyiṃ viracisuveṃ). 395 He is equally clear, however, that the Ādipurāṇaṃ is kāvya poetry. He describes it as having the qualities of both kāvya and dharma, but not just any dharma; the Ādipurāṇaṃ is “filled with the juice of aestheticized emotion of the nectar of dharma (dharmāmṛtarasamaya). 396

In writing a religious poem with an aesthetic focus, signaled by his use of the term rasa or aestheticized emotion, Pampa challenges what we might imagine as the appropriate topics and sentiments for Jain poetry. Early on, he sets the tone of his text by comparing the work of poetry to the work of a prostitute:

By increasing the emotion of the rasa with the gait of soft steps, with the sequence of soft words, a literary work is like a trafficked woman, a mine of beauty and geniality. Does she/it agitate the minds of clever and wise men? 397

---

394 Indira Peterson, Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic: The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 10. For distinctions between traditional Sanskrit genres also see Gary Tubb, “The Kumārasaṃbhava in the Light of Indian Theories of the Mahākāvya” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1979), 7.
395 PĀP, v. 1.42 {kanda}.
396 Ibid., v. 16.43 {kanda}.
397 mṛdupadagatiṃ rasabhāvada percīṃ panyavanitevōl kṛtisaundaryada cāturyada kanjyene vidagdhabudhajanada manaman aleyalevēdā || PĀP, 1.17 {kanda}.
The first line of the verse (mṛdupadagatiyim rasabhāvada perciṃ) is a double-entendre (ślēṣa) that describes the soft steps (mṛdupada) of the prostitute (paṇyavanite) as well as the soft words (mṛdupada) of a literary work (kṛti). In contrast, in his Vikramārjunavijayaṃ, Pampa’s later non-Jain work, he compares poetry to a virginal maiden or baby (kūsu). If we see these two texts as literary twins as Pampa certainly did, it is striking that the female analogy of the Ādipurāṇaṃ is the prostitute and the Vikramārjunavijayaṃ is the virgin. It is easy to over-interpret the importance and weight of such a literary chiasmus; however, it sets markedly different tones for these poems that cut against the grain of our contemporary secular and religious sensibilities. What does it mean for an aesthetic tenor of a religious poem to be like a prostitute? I am still not sure I have the answer.

However, Pampa apparently found the image of the prostitute-like poem to be very revealing for elucidating the meta-poetics of the Ādipurāṇaṃ. He continues with the comparison of poetry and prostitution, saying:

A good poet knows the secret of poetry.  
Will he who is blind, deaf, and mute understand?  
A john can recognize second-rate johns.  
But does he necessarily know the secrets of pleasing a woman?

In this dense verse, Pampa claims that a good poet (satkavi) knows the secret of poetry (kavitārahasya), but the mere status of being a poet is not enough to know such secrets.

---

398 VAV, v. 1.9 {utpalamāle}. In modern Kannada, kūsu more generically refers to a baby. However, the word has a more expansive meaning in premodern Kannada. Kittle defines it as, “A male or female infant, a babe; a maid, a young virgin; a person.” KED, 459.

399 kavitārahasyamaṃ satkaviyaṟigum anēḍamokan ēḍam jaḍan em-bavan arīgume viṭan ēḍam kuviṭaṃ strīraṭaḥasyadoḷagaṟedapanē || PĀP, 1.20 {kanda}.
The latter point is achieved by metaphorically collapsing the identity of the poet with that of a john (viṭa) and the secret of poetry with the secret of pleasing a woman (strīratarahasya). We are left with the implied question: a poet can recognize second-rate poets, but does he necessarily know the secrets of poetry? Here, neither prostitutes nor those who solicit are objects of moral condemnation, but instead are figures skilled in sophisticated arts comparable to the writing of poetry. In drawing this parallel, Pampa destabilizes expectations about the forms of experiences that can analogize poetry and in the process begins a broader transformation in the tenor and quality of Jain poetry itself. Pampa is far less concerned with religious instruction than his predecessor Jinasēna and far more invested in exploring the emotional registers available in the courtly world of the Ādipurāṇam, a world present, but relatively unexplored in Jinasēna’s earlier Sanskrit version. Put plainly, the analogy of poetry to prostituti...
alluring. In Pampa, however, we see the copresence of a narrative of renunciation that sticks with the objects being renounced in all of their seductiveness and materiality. Pampa writes from an assumed subject position of someone’s who is about to renounce the world, but, somewhat antithetically, from the perspective of someone who still appreciates its beauty. Put slightly differently, Pampa recognizes that worldly attachments must be renounced, but still relishes in the beauty and pleasure that they offer. I read this notable poetic disjuncture between Jinasēna and Pampa’s Ādipurāṇas as indexing an important difference between Jain monastic versus lay-produced poetry and central to their diverging interpretations of the Ādipurāṇa narrative.

Ṛṣabha’s renunciatory awakening while watching the courtesan Nilānjane dance is one such example of where Pampa’s poetry clearly differentiates itself from Jinasēna. The scenes in Jinasēna and Pampa commence in the same way, Ṛṣabha is ensconced in his court when Indra arrives and commands the divine dancers to begin their performance. The texts then diverge. Pampa says, “Smiling with a lotus face, Indra, respectfully asks, ‘What is your bliss? Let it happen.’ He then directs the exalted host of gods to begin.” While in Jinasēna, Indra rhetorically asks himself, “‘How can I completely distract the lord from the pleasures of the kingdom?’ Then the king of gods dispatches a dancer near the end of her life.” Explicit in Jinasēna and assumed in Pampa, the entirety of the following scene is intended to prompt Ṛṣabha’s renunciation of his kingdom. Having literally set the stage, Jinasēna proceeds directly to a description of

---

400 This scene is a particularly famous one in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam. When I first began reading the text with Shubhachandra Jain in Mysore in 2009, he was particularly insistent that we read this section together.
401 PĀP, v. 9.13 {kanda}.
402 JĀP, v. 17.6
the dancer’s performance: “After that, attended by a retinue, the charming divine dancer, Nilāñjanā by name, dances with aestheticized emotion, emotion, and rhythm.”  

Nilānjane’s dance, captured by Jinasēna in a single verse, takes Pampa a full twenty-six verses to describe.

Throughout his text, Pampa’s intense poetic elaboration utterly breaks with Jinasēna’s brevity. He spends three verses just on the accompanying music, describing it as “immersing the court in aestheticized emotion,” surpassing “the sounds shinning forth from the God of Love’s bow and from his handsome wife’s vīna,” and prompting the entirety of the court to exclaim “Oh, the songs! Oh, the music!” Praise her clothes, ornaments, and flower garlands, Pampa introduces us to the beautiful body of the dancer Nilānjane, a body so beautiful that not even Indra can properly praise it. We are told that this divine music is appropriate for her alone. He continues with a set of verses that elaborately describe Nilānjane and her effects on the audience:

Suddenly, Nilānjane entered the stage and into all the people’s hearts  
as if a pointed flower arrow shot from the God of love’s sugarcane bow.  
She stood in a shape of the moving creeper of the God of Love.  
It was as if the rasas pooled together and resided within her.  
With the concealment of the curtain,  
she resembled a flash of lightening under the veil of a cloud.  
Drawing back the curtain, Kāma drew his bow to shoot an arrow.  
His flower-tipped arrows repeatedly materialized in the court  
in the same manner as the falling flowers from her opening benediction.  
Her reflection was visible in the splendor of the jeweled necklace  
shining on the chests of the famous kings.

---

403 Ibid., v. 17.7.  
404 PĀP, vv. 9.14-22{kanda}.  
405 Ibid., v. 9.17 {kanda}.  
406 Ibid., v. 9.18 {kanda}.  
248
From there, it was as if she entered their hearts. She appeared beautiful in the theatre. With the slow, medium, and fast musical rhythms, all filled with the *rasa* of the God of Love, the famous and lavish musical instruments followed the rules of music and dance. Endless auspiciousness shone. Her sari pleats, black curls, and striking pearl necklace joined together to embrace the beat of the music. With disheveled hair, the lady herself embraced it. Oh, what a wonder! Her aestheticized emotion, emotions, and art of expression were very new. Her stage entrance was entirely new. Her movements were utterly new. Her method was absolutely new. And her poses were completely new. It is as if this lady revolutionized the science of dance. The particular beauty of Nīlāñjane was in expanding the emotions and in propelling the aestheticized emotions in the styles of dance called Bhārati, Sāvati, Kaiśiki, and Arabhati. When the art of expression of the flowing *rasa* was experienced in that dancer’s divisions of emotion, shimmering excitant, and consequent, it was impossible for even Ādīdēva and Dēvēndra to understand. With prominent breasts, she exhibited bodily expression on the shining minor limbs of her body and verbal expression through the musical text. The subtle and peripheral expressions of that divine lady are innate to be sure. In Bharata’s *Āgama*, there are thirty-two famous gestures and a hundred and eight poses. If even the female servant holding her spittoon knows them all, is it even possible for Nīlāñjane to make a mistake? She seemed to enter and exit their hearts with the style of her entries and exits on stage. She appeared to spill fresh nectar from her bud-like smile onto their smiling faces. What beauty befits her? Without even knowing the divine music, she didn’t miss a beat or become fatigued. She made beautiful the arrangement and notes the colorful necklace as if arranging a colorful necklace. Oh! What a skilled woman is she! When the drumstick and hand searched for the rhythm, without pause, she signaled the rhythm with her eyebrow for the drummer as if her eyebrow itself was a drumstick. This dancer became the drummer to the court. One after another, her eyebrows danced. One after the other, they played laks of different styles to the rhythm.

---

407 Here Pampa employs suggestion (*dhvani*) through the imagery of Nīlāñjane appearing on the kings’ chests. In this scenario, Nīlāñjane is the goddess Lakṣmi who resides on Viṣṇu’s chest whereas the kings are the god himself.
How can the divine beauty’s seductively moving eyebrows be described further?\textsuperscript{408}

\begin{quote}
enisida nīlānjane ka-
rbina billaṃ maseda madananalargaše barduṅki-
ttenisuttolopkkaḥ bhō-
ṅkane nikhi|ajanāntaraṅgamaṃ raṅgamumamā || 9.19 \{kanda\}
niltuvu rasaṅgaḷ illi ma-
daṭtene bhaṅgiyoḷ anāṅgajaṅgamalatevol
niltu javanikeya māreyoḷ
pōltal aval mugilamareya vidyullateyamā || 9.20 \{kanda\}
ōsarisida javanikeyoda-
ṅlōsaridasidan isale kantu puspāṅjaliyaṃ
sūśida padadoḷe saborasaṃ
eśusidanoḍanoḍane naneya moneyambugalaṃ || 9.21 \{kanda\}
negeḷe nijapratibimbaṃ
eśegaldarasugaluroḷ eševa hāraṇaṃidyō-
tīgaḷoḷ avarerdeyan alliṃ
puguṇudanunukarisi raṅgadaḷ sogayisidaḷ || 9.22 \{kanda\}
atanurasūpētavilam-
ṅtāsakaladhyadhṛtalayaṅgaḷoḷ lāksaṇasam-
yutatavānugatauṛgha-
pratītavāṇyāṅgaḷ eseduvatiśubhadaṅgaḷ || 9.23 \{kanda\}
tāḷada layamaṃ niṅ nī-
ḷaḷaka hārada podalḍa muttembivu mum
mēlisi kaikōṇḍuḷuḷi-
tāḷaki kaikōṇḍalā embudondacchariē || 9.24 \{kanda\}
rasabhāvābhīnayāṅgaḷ
posave pugil posave calligal posave nayaṃ
posave karaṅgaḷaḷuṃ ni-
nposavene posayisidaḷ āke nātyāgamamaṃ || 9.25 \{kanda\}
bhāratisávatikaiśiki-
yārabhaṭiyum emba vrḗtiyoḷ rasamaṃ saṅ-
cārisuva hāvamaṃ vi-
stārisuva bedaṅgu bēre nīlānjaneḥaṃ || 9.26 \{kanda\}
bhāvadanubhāvadeseva vi-
bhāvada pasugelalōḷ osarva rasadabhinayamam
bhāvisuvōdīdēvāna
dēvendrana bagemg aśadaḷaṃ nartakiyā || 9.27 \{kanda\}
āṅgōpāṅgaṅgaḷoḷ ese-
vāṅgikamaṃ gānapāṅhyadoḷ vēcikamaṃ
tungaku ce meredalā divi-
jēṅganēghāryasātvīkamā niṃjame valam || 9.28 \{kanda\}
bharatāgamadulā muve-
tteraṇe negaldaṅghārāmanuṃ nűrenṭum
karaṇum amalu ḍavakeya
\end{quote}
These verses describing Nilāñjane are what Pampa is most famous for. This poetry, tightly packed with similes and metaphors, relishes in and lingers over the very object that will prompt Rṣabha’s renunciation. Nilāñjane’s actions on stage—her entrances, exits, and benedictions—mirror those of the God of Love and, by extension, the emotions of the audience. She enters the kings’ hearts through her entry onto the stage and, by extension, through her image reflected in their necklaces. From every single angle, Pampa conveys that this woman is the epitome of beauty, grace, and sensuality. But he also takes delight in describing her incredible skill as a dancer and, indeed, this is his real focal point; even her clothes and ornaments respond to the musical beat, she is so knowledgeable in the science of dance that even her attendant knows the entirety of Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra, and, perhaps most playfully, the repetitive and alternating arching of her brows generates the beat for the faltering musicians who, we can only assume, simply cannot keep up with her.

paricārikeyarigum ākegavu toḍarvedeye || 9.29 {kanda}
puguva poṟamaḍuva teṟaderde-vuguvaḷ poṟamaḍuvaḷ enise posatamardam mē-
guguldapal enise muguḷnage
nagemogadol adēṃ bedaṅgavalgoppidūdō || 9.30 {kanda}
pesar ariyadamara tūrya-prasaraṅgaḷa datige toḍaradiniselalade
baṅṇasarāṅ gōdantire
baṅṇasarāṁ sogayisidūdēn aval pariṇateyō || 9.31 {kanda}
kuḍupuṁ kayyuṁ jatiyoḷ
taḍataḍavare vādakaṅge purvim jatiyam
toḍarade naḍeyisi purvide
kuḍupene nartakiye sabhege vādakiyādal || 9.32 {kanda}
ondondam naḍeyisuvudā-
dondondara layake lake teṟan āḍuvudē-
n endim baṅṇisuvudo sura-
saundariya vilāsavibhrama bhrūlateyō || PĀP, 9.33 {kanda}
The poetry that describes her performance is loaded with technical language drawn from theories of dance, drama, and music. In deploying such theoretical language, Pampa’s verses about Nilāñjane’s beautiful dance are imbued with a precise aesthetic understanding of how and why she has such effects on the audience. She marshals emotion (bhāva) and the art of expression (abhinaya) to create an aestheticized emotion (rasa) in the viewer. The aesthetic theory to which Pampa refers is the classical Sanskrit system first laid out in Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra that is structured around the cultivation of eight aestheticized emotions: compassion (karuna), disgust (bibhatsa), fear (bhayanaka), fury (raudra), heroism (vīra), humor (hasya), erotic love (śṛṅgāra), and wonder (adbhuta) to which peace (śānta) was later added. These rasas are connected to stable emotions (sthāyibhāva), that is, real world emotions such as love (rati) and grief (śōka), through which the aesthetic experience of rasa is evoked. While an excellent piece of Sanskrit poetry is supposed to generate all nine rasas, it should also foreground one rasa (aṅgīrasa) to which the remaining eight are subordinated. Central to this theory is the notion that the reader does not experience these rasas as directly felt emotions, but instead inhabits a psychical distance that enables an aesthetic appreciation of a universalizable emotion of the rasa (one does not physically feel bibhatsa or disgust, but rather relishes in its beauty). One frequently invoked rule is that the cultivated rasa should never be directly named nor, by extension, should a poet state that rasa is being evoked. This makes a great deal of sense. After all, as Sheldon Pollock notes in relation to Bhavabhūti’s Uttararāmacarita, “It requires only a moment’s thought to see that the erotic illusion of a scene will be destroyed by announcing, ‘Here’s an erotic scene.’”

409 Sheldon Pollock, trans., Rama’s Last Act, (New York: New York University Press,
But both Bhavabhūti and Pampa break this seemingly cardinal rule and talk explicitly about *rasa*. One might then read Pampa’s use of a technical aesthetic vocabulary during the dance of Nīlāñjane and later throughout the text as the misfire of an uneducated poet. However, Pampa’s poetry—his use of rhetorical devices, sophisticated grasp of language, and breadth of metrical knowledge—betrays the work of a skilled poet. Pampa’s use of the technical language of *rasa* was no accident, but rather a calculated and intentional decision. The question then is, why did he choose to write in this way? What effect does a technical language embedded within an already thickly descriptive poetics achieve?

In perhaps the most important footnote to be written about Sanskrit poetry in some time, Jesse Ross Knutson with input from Larry McCrea shows how this dictum against naming the *rasa* originated from a misreading of *kārikā* 1.4 of Ānandavardhana’s *Dhvanyālōka* (9th c.) that crystallized only in Mammaṭa’s *Kāvyaprakāśa* (c. 11 or 12th c.).\(^{410}\) If we follow their argument, the writing of Pampa’s *Ādipurāṇaṃ* in the tenth century actually preceded the formulation of the rule. Even if Pampa did not break the literary convention of the time, the question still remains as to the effects of such aesthetic explicitness. Given that Sanskrit aesthetic theory is centered around aestheticized emotions, the broader Sanskrit vocabulary of affect gets enfolded into this system (of *anubhāva, rasa, sañcari bhāva, sthāyibhāva,* and *vībhāva*). Therefore, it is difficult to talk about emotion in Sanskrit or a Sanskrit inflected vernacular outside of this form of aesthetics. While Pampa certainly sought to cultivate Sanskrit aesthetics within

---

\(^{410}\) Jesse Knutson, *Into the Twilight of Sanskrit Court Poetry: The Sena Salon of Bengal and Beyond* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 175, fn. 18. Knutson also observes a “trend in naming the rasa” as part of a “grand reflexive turn in later Sanskrit poetry.” Ibid, 54.
his Ādipurāṇaṃ, he was also interested in delineating a Jain emotional ontology and its workings in transmigration in the newly available literary language of Kannada. By referencing rasa, Pampa signals both his aesthetic investment as well as his religious commitments in understanding emotion and human attachment. In the case of Nilāñjane, her description through the language of rasa attempts to capture her aesthetic effect on the audience in the clear context of a dramatic performance, but I would also argue that it attempts render the saturated emotional complexity of the court on the brink of Rṣabha’s renunciation. Pampa’s use of Sanskrit aesthetic vocabulary to talk about emotion problematizes the extent to which we graph Sanskrit literary norms onto vernacular ones. Regardless of their close grammatical or lexical relationships, different languages employ different forms of aesthetics.

While the cultivation of rasa was the most obvious way that poets could render poetry beautiful, it was not the only tool available. The popularity of campū kāvya at this moment indicates that meter too was an effective avenue through which to intensify the beauty of poetry. These richly draw verses about Nilāñjane are composed in simple kanda meter (Prk khandha; Skt, skandhakalārṇyāgīti). In Kannada literature, kanda comes to be structurally equivalent to Sanskrit ślōka meter, most commonly used for epic literature as well as technical and scientific discourse. Within the diverse metrical economy of campū kāvya, we might imagine that such beautifully complex verses warrant equally complex meters. For example, a rhythmic meter that mimics the beat of Nilāñjane’s drumstick eyebrows. However, Pampa chose to write this section, the volta of his entire text in which the main character Rṣabha renounces his kingdom, in a simple Prakrit derived meter comprised of four moras. Pampa’s pervasive use of a single meter
at this moment, *kanda* or otherwise, is unique within his broader *campū* style in which he regularly intersperses prose passages into poetry composed in a wide range of meters.\(^{411}\)

What effect does this meter have on the poetry? Why *kanda* meter? In this context, *kanda* meter creates a frenzied poetic pace through its simplicity. The reader moves quickly from verse to verse, gaining momentum along the way. What does this momentum lead to? After twenty-six descriptive verses, Pampa realigns his text with Jinasēna. He says, “Then, that charming form with softness like a creeper, her life came to an end. Suddenly, like lightening, the divine lady became invisible in the theater. Then…”\(^{412}\)

While Jinasēna describes the same moment as, “Her body shown by giving off the splendor of lightening. Reaching the end of her life, she instantaneously disappeared as if extinguishing a lamp.”\(^{413}\) Nīlāñjane dies and her body vanishes from the stage. Her contrived death anchors Indra’s plot to prompt Ṛṣabha’s renunciation of the pleasures of the kingdom.

After Nīlāñjane’s death, Pampa and Jinasēna’s text move in parallel, describing how Indra, out of concern for the disruption of the *rasa* (*rasabhaṅgabhaya*), immediately produces an exact replica of Nīlāñjane. No one in the audience except Ṛṣabha grasps what has happened. The transience of Nīlāñjane’s beautiful body awakens Ṛṣabha to the larger reality of the transience of the mundane world, thereby producing the disaffection necessary for renunciation. Pampa puts it most concisely: in watching Nīlāñjane’s dance

\(^{411}\) *Kanda* is unique among Pampa’s meters in that, as far as I have observed, he rarely if never uses it for a stand alone verse, but always in a secession of a minimum of three to five verses.

\(^{412}\) *PĀP*, v. 9.41 {*kanda*}.

\(^{413}\) *JĀP*, v. 17.8
Ṛṣabha also observed the dance of transmigration itself.\footnote{PĀP, v. 9.45 \textit{(kanda)}.} Then in eight corresponding verses, Pampa and Jinasēna dive into the qualities that define birth as a hell being, an animal, a human, and a divine being. Unsurprisingly, we are told that all four births are defined by overriding sorrow. At this point, Pampa breaks with Jinasēna’s text; other than this brief explication of \textit{karma} and rebirth, Pampa has nothing more to say on this matter whereas Jinasēna continues to expand upon the quality of the soul, \textit{karma}, and its connection to Nilāñjane. Jinasēna’s character of Ādinātha goes on to state:

\begin{quote}
The soul is destroyed in an instant. It grows old in an instant. It obtains rebirth in an instant. Like a cow, it is plunged into the mud of birth, death, old age, and grief. Thus, in the state of a simpleminded animal, it endlessly suffers. Indeed, the Jinas consider the animal kingdom a site of supreme sorrow. Therefore, with its sin slightly reduced, the soul escapes from that hardship. It reaches human birth driven by the charioteer in the form of \textit{karma}. Even in that birth, the body continues to experience manifold sorrows. As desire reaches the mind, the soul is obstructed by enemies in the form of \textit{karma}. Born from serving others, poverty, worry, grief, and so on, the evident sorrow of great men becomes like hell. The carriage that is the human body is filled with bad implements in the form of sorrow. Without a doubt, it will overturn after three or four days. Indeed, in a divine birth, those bodies partake in happiness. Although, after they fall from heaven, the gods experience unbearable pain. Even in that place, there is separation from loved ones although it is somewhat less. Therefore, the misery of those divine minds mounts with sorrow. With a variety of twists and turns, the soul experiences sorrow in that sphere of transmigration. From the consequences of bad \textit{karma}, it obtains a wretched state. The body of Nilāñjanā, perfectly slender, is an instrument. Without moving, how did she disappear before our very eyes? Her female form possesses a radiant exterior. Considering her to be beautiful, they fall in love with her. Desirous they perish there like a moth. But that illusory dancer contrived by that intelligent god, immediately impacted my thinking, awakening me. Accordingly, just as the limbs of her body are perishable, temporary and duplicitous so too are the limbs of worldly pleasure.\footnote{\textit{PĀP}, v. 9.45 \textit{(kanda)}.} \end{quote}
Jinasēna describes the momentary quality of the soul and returns to the four types of birth for further elaboration. At every stage, *karma* works on the soul, acting as charioteer driving the cycle of rebirth forward or as a tormenting enemy. Verses parallel to these are simply absent in Pampa. Jinasēna and Pampa already described the cycle of rebirth and so Jinasēna’s additional specification is, in some measure, redundant. Pampa, as a reader in the process of rewriting Jinasēna, chooses to contract such moments of Jinasēna’s philosophical excess.

\[\text{kṣaṇānnaśyan kṣṇājajīryan kṣṇājjanmasamāpnuvan} \mid \text{Janmanṛtyujarātāṅkapanke majjati gauriva} \mid 17.27\]

\[\text{anantaṃ kālamityajñastiryaṅkve duḥkhamaśnute} \mid \text{Duḥkhasya hi paraṁ dhāma tiryaktvaṁ manvate jināḥ} \mid 17.28\]

\[\text{Tataḥ kṛcchād viniḥṣṛtya śīthile duṣkṛte manāk} \mid \text{manuṣyabhāvamāpnoti karmasārathicodīḥ} \mid 17.29\]

\[\text{tatrāpi vividhaṁ duḥkhaṁ ṣārīraṁ caiva mānasam} \mid \text{prānopayanicchurevāṁ niruddhaṁ karmasatrubhiḥ} \mid 17.30\]

\[\text{parārādhanaṁ añcāntacintā śokādisambhāvāṁ} \mid \text{duḥkhaṁ mahanmanuṣyaṁ pratyakṣaṁ narākayate} \mid 17.31\]

\[\text{ṣārīrasaktaṁ duḥkhadurbhāṅḍaiḥ paripūrītaṁ} \mid \text{dinaistracāreva paryasyati na samāyaiḥ} \mid 17.32\]

\[\text{divyabhāve kilaṅteṁ sukhabhāṅktvaṁ ṣārīrāṇāṁ} \mid \text{tatrāpi trividād vātāḥ paraṁ duḥkhaṁ duruttaraṁ} \mid 17.33\]

\[\text{tatrāpiṣaviyogo asti nyūnāstātrāpi kecana} \mid \text{tato mānasometeṣaṁ dukhaṁ dukhena ladghyate} \mid 17.34\]

\[\text{iti saṁṣāracakre asminū vicitraiḥ parivartanaṁ} \mid \text{duḥkhamāpnoti duṣkarmaparipākād varākakaḥ} \mid 17.35\]

\[\text{nārīṁnaṁyaṁ yantramidamatiyantapelavaṁ} \mid \text{paśyatāmeva nah sāksāt kathametadagāllyayaṁ} \mid 17.36\]

\[\text{rāmaṁyaṁdaṁ matvā strīrūpaṁ bahirujāvalaḥ} \mid \text{patantastaṁ naśyanti patamga iva kāmukāḥ} \mid 17.37\]

\[\text{kūṭanāṭakametattu prayuktamamareśiṁ} \mid \text{nūnamasmatprabodhāya śrūtimādhāya dhīmatā} \mid 17.38\]

\[\text{yathādameva bhaṅguraṁ niyatiṣṭhitam kevalam tatpralabhyakaṁ} \mid JĀP, 17.39\]
Other than these strategies of elaboration and contraction, Pamba also adopts and reworks Jinasēna’s poetic imagery into Kannada. We see this in the very next set of verses where Pamba, quoted here on the right, and Jinasēna, on the left, re-converge:

Indeed, what is the purpose of ornaments that are weights? What is the purpose of fragrant unguents that are shit? What is the purpose of dancing that is the movements of a madman? What is the purpose of music that is grief?416

Ornaments are a weight on the body. Fresh unguent is shit. Dance destroys music. Let me think, “is this not an insane game? Do any of these things have a singular essence?”417

The conceit of these two verses is the same; they comment on the pointlessness of beautifying the body and engaging in song and dance. Pamba (even though a great fan of the rhetorical question himself) recasts Jinasēna’s questions into declarative statements. Instead of “what is the purpose of ornaments that are weights” we get “ornaments are a weight on the body.” Pamba maintains Jinasēna’s metaphor, but in rewriting the verse in Kannada, he puts his own imprint on Jinasēna’s concept. In fact, Pamba’s version is more to the point than Jinasēna’s, suggesting that his brief moments of philosophical speculation require a precision and directness unnecessary in Jinasēna’s more lengthy elaborations. We see Pamba’s strategy of reworking Jinasēna’s poetics throughout his text from Nīlāṇjane’s lightening-like quality to the kingdom’s noxiousness.

---

416 kim kilābharanaṇaibhāraiḥ kim malairanulepanaiḥ | Unmattaceṣṭitaṁrṇttairalam gītaiś ca śocitaiḥ || JĀP, 17.40

417 tanuge poṇe tuḍuge navalē-paname maḷaṃ gītam aḷke nṛtyaṁ bageya-lkenage dal unmattakavi-la-sanam intinitaṇḍam ondaṇḍ puruḷ uṇṭē || PĀP, 9.55 {kanda}
But Pampa is not a derivative poet. He engages language in ways that are distinctly his own and unrelated to Jinasēna. For example, in Pampa’s detailed description of Nīlāṅjane’s dance, he says,

Without even knowing the divine music, she didn’t miss a beat or become fatigued. She made beautiful the musical notes and sounds / the colorful necklace as if arranging a colorful necklace / as if arranging the musical notes and sounds.

Oh! What a skilled women is she?

Such a verse is difficult to properly render in English. Pampa starts by praising Nīlāṅjane’s skill by noting that she is not thrown off nor does she find it tiring to dance to music with which she is unfamiliar. He then describes how she makes the “musical notes and sounds” (baṇṇasara) beautiful. The words in this compound have a double meaning that also translate to a “colorful necklace.” The force of this double-entendre (ślēśa) is heightened through a further simile that compares her skillful beautification of the notes/necklace to the act of arranging a colorful necklace, again reduplicating the same compound from the double-entendre (baṇṇasara). This verse, ostensibly about the capabilities of a dancer, is densely cathected to a complex and layered poetic conceit, a conceit that is purely Pampa’s alone.

3. Spheres of Experience: Jainism, Kingship, and Rasa

The example of Nīlāṅjane’s dance given above is helpful for discerning Pampa’s broader literary strategies and his relationship to Jinasēna’s earlier version of the same narrative. In putting these texts side by side, we can clearly see these various strategies at

418

pesar aṟiyadamaratūrya-prasaraṅgaḷa datige toḍaradinniselalade ba-
ṇṇasaraṅgōdantire ba-
ṇṇasaraṃ sogayisidudēn aval pariṇateyō || 9.31 {kanda}
work in rewriting a Sanskrit text into Kannada at a moment when, by the tenth century, Kannada had become the dominant language of elite courtly culture. And, indeed, it is this courtly literary sensibility that comes to the fore in Pampa’s poetry. For example, Pampa exploits the scene of Nīlāñjane’s performance as a moment to relish in the details of courtly life—remember he goes on for twenty-six additional verses about Nīlāñjane’s beauty, ornamented body, and artistic skill whereas Jinasēna simply stops after a single line of description. These verses are also helpful in identifying Pampa’s use of the language of aesthetic theory to talk about emotion writ large and his broader investment in exploring the literary and ethical consequences of a distinctly Jain emotional ontology.

The initial framing of this scene is important to keep in mind. Indra’s goal in orchestrating Nīlāñjane’s dance is to prompt King Ṛṣabha to renounce his kingdom. As in Jinasēna so too in Pampa, kingship follows a standardized and repetitive trajectory: the father’s renunciation to the son’s assumption, a phase of royal sumptuary or even erotic excess, epiphany regarding the futility of the kingdom and its renunciation, the crowning of an heir, and the embarkation on the path of asceticism. In my reading of these two authors, Jinasēna is invested in the tropic figure of the king and his kingdom whereas Pampa is interested in the king situated in the world of the court and the aesthetic, emotional, and sumptuary opportunities that such a world affords. While impossible to separate entirely, it is the courtliness I think rather than the kingliness that poetically occupies Pampa. The trajectory of kingship and renunciation repeatedly imagined by the Ādipurāṇa genre is one that naturally aligns with the literary aesthetic of peace (śānta). After all, kingship rightly lived culminates in the renunciation of the kingdom. For Jain and Buddhist kāvya there is no other rasa that can predominate besides śānta, leading to
a very particular and obvious religious and aesthetic convergence. The Ādi narrative mimetically mirrors the repetitions of transmigration (samsāra) such that in each life that Ādinātha is born as a king he renounces his kingdom. These cycles of kingship and renunciation are further reflected in aesthetic repetitions in which each cycle culminates in peace. Put another way, the foregrounding of sānta as the predominate rasa automatically occurs in Jain literature through its literary mimesis of samsāra. Given this, it is not particularly surprising that Pampa explicitly names sānta or sāntarasa as well as vīrarasa four times in his text. This explicit naming (and the subtle and not so subtle cultivation of these particular rasas) unproblematically accords with the soteriology of the Ādipurāṇaṃ; peace and renunciation are inextricably intertwined. Less clear, however, is how erotic love (śṛṅgāra), equally ubiquitous in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ, fits into a Jain doctrine of salvation. And yet, in a text so fixated on the figure of the king and the context of the court, erotic love is simply unavoidable. As Daud Ali notes, “Erotic love, if we follow our sources, was one of the most important concerns of the collective life of the people at court.” Sanskrit and elite vernacular literature both reflect and shape such courtly investments through a focus on erotic love, romantic liaison, and sexual intrigue. In particular, kings appear in premodern South Asian literature as romantically and sexually entangled figures bursting with virility. For Pampa, it is less the figure of the king than the intimate experiences afforded by the king

420 Śṛṅgāra is similarly named in vacanas 7.3, vacana 7.21, vacana 7.38, vacana 8.32, and vacana 13.45. In addition, Pampa comes up with his own rasas outside of the standard nine-fold framework, including dayārasa (the rasa of compassion) in verses 1.5 and 5.53, śōkarasa (the rasa of grief) in vacana 3.55, nirvēgarasa (the rasa of calm) in vacana 3.55, and garvarasa (the rasa of pride) in verse 13.71.
421 Ali, Courtly Culture, 209.
that become a site through which to grapple with the place of human intimacy, sexuality, and affective attachment within a Jain soteriological framework.

The relationship between kingship and the realm of pleasure or sensual enjoyment goes beyond a matter of literary perspective. Jinasēna and Pampa employ a whole host of words to talk about kingship, the kingdom, and sovereignty, most commonly rājya or samrājya. However, at very particular moments in their texts, they use the word viṣaya, a word that possesses a range of meanings, including kingdom, dominion, a subject matter, an object of the senses, sensuality and sensual enjoyment. My reading of this context specific usage is that Jinasēna and later Pampa exploit the capaciousness of language to collapse the realms of the kingdom and sensual pleasure.  

For example, Pampa repeatedly uses the phrase viṣayavirkatan āgi in the context of a king renouncing his kingdom, an act made clear by the crowning of an heir. However, the phrase “viṣayavirkatan āgi” translates both to “having become disaffected with the kingdom” as well as “having become disaffected with sensual pleasure.” The collapse between these two realms is further strengthened and made intentional by Pampa’s consistent use of the

---

422 A few other scholars have noticed the multiplicity of meanings of viṣaya as a signifier of the kingdom, on the one hand, and sensual pleasure or a worldly object, on the other, including Kanaiyalal Maneklal Munshi, Glory that was Gūrjaradeśa, A.D. 550-1300 (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1955), 271 and D.C. Sircar, Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India, (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1966), 86. Most notably, D.R. Bhandarkar comes to a similar translation of viṣaya in verse forty-two of his translation of the Sañjan Plates of Amoghavarsha. He says, “The soul is the king; the mind is his minister; the group of senses is again that circle of feudatories according to the political science; and speech, &c., are the servants conforming to the prescribed rules. Presiding over his place, namely, the body, he (the soul) is able to enjoy, independently, his own vishaya (kingdom; worldly objects). When that enjoyer is subject to saṁnipāta (a kind of fever, collision), they all perish.” “No. 26—Sanjan Plates of Amoghavarsha I: Saka-Samvat 793,” EI Vol. 18, 255.

423 PĀP, vacana v. 2.18.
adjective poisonous (viṣa) to describe them. For example, describing the circumstances that led to King Daṇḍaka to be reborn as a snake, he says,

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{viṣayāmīṣa}lampaṭateye \\
&\text{viṣadharan enisidudu ninnan ele viṣadhara nim} \\
&\text{viṣadharan āgade bēgaṃ} \\
&\text{viṣayāmīṣaviṣaman uguḻdu nirviṣanāgā}. \quad 424
\end{align*}
\]

Your desire for sensual pleasure caused you to become a snake. Oh snake, bearer of poison! Quickly spit out your poisonous desire for sex. Without poison, you became fangless.

Or, alternatively,

Your greedy desire for the kingdom caused you to become a snake. Oh snake, bearer of poison! Quickly spit out your poisonous desire for the kingdom. Without poison, you became fangless.

Pampa capitalizes on the alliterative quality of the words kingdom/sensual pleasure (viṣaya), poison (viṣa), and snake (viṣadhara) to their maximum poetic potential (bolded in the quote above). Alliteration of the second consonant of each line (a type of anuprāsa known as dvīṭyākṣaraprāsa; here the syllable “ṣa”), commonly referred to in English scholarship as head rhyme, is a mandatory feature of classical Kannada campū, a feature that Pampa adheres to with great precision.\(^{425}\) Pampa also repeatedly employs vinutaprāsa, alliteration of the same vowel and consonant (the bolded reduplicated syllables “vi” and “ṣa.”), throughout this verses to emphasize the euphonic and conceptual interconnectivity of these three word, a technique that also functions as a yamaka, a rhetorical figure “in which identical syllabic sequences are repeated, to yield

\[^{424}\text{Ibid., v. 2.17 {kanda}}\]
different meanings.”

Context brings us no clarity around the capacious meaning of the word *viṣaya*. King Daṇḍaka lords over his material wealth, but we are given no details about his relationships to sensual pleasure or the kingdom. That leaves this verse open to two distinct yet interpenetrating readings. In each instance, *viṣaya* implies both kingdom and sensual pleasure; both are unambiguously poisonous.

It is not just desire for the kingdom and sexual pleasure that Pampa deems to be dangerous. Desire for emotion or even aestheticized emotion has the potential to kill.

One by one the desire of the *rasas* will kill us one after the other.
Ouch! If you consider sensualistic people like me,
the terrible poisons of the kingdom will clobber and kill us /
sensual enjoyment will clobber and kill us.\(^{427}\)

When he says “one by one” (*ondonde* *rasas* will kill he is clearly referencing the succession of the nine aestheticized emotions. At the same time, read through Pampa’s peculiar usage—as seen in the dance of Nīlāñjane—, this verse also comments on the pursuit of emotion, beyond its aestheticized form. I read this verse as another example of Pampa using the to hand vocabulary of *rasa* to talk about emotion. *Rasa* in this verse is connected to sensuality and the kingdom through their collective condemnation. They are interconnected spheres of experience. Pampa’s denunciation of these spheres might seem surprising since they comprise the focus of his text. However, such poetic ambiguity makes apparent the contradistinction between what is beautiful and what is good.

Pampa’s *Ādipurāṇaṃ* is an attempt to recuperate these seemingly negative spheres of

---

\(^{426}\) Peterson, *Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic*, 151.

\(^{427}\) ondonde rasada sōlam a-
vondondane kolgum ōvō lampāṭar appe-
mmandigaraṃ bagedandaḍe
kondikkave sakalaviṣayaviṣamaviṣaṅgal || 4.73 {kanda}
experience by aligning them within a Jain soteriology that ends in renunciation and liberation.

4. Transmigratory Love: From Śṛṅgāra to Bhakti

At no point is Pampa’s investment in the nexus of erotic love, kingship, and elite courtly culture more clear than in the karmically driven transmigratory romance between the God Lalitāṅga (Ādinātha’s third birth) and his divine consort Svayaṃprabhe. Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ like Jinasēna’s earlier version is structured around three discrete sections: 1) the first ten incarnations of Ādinātha’s soul entangled with the souls of the other main characters, 2) Ādinātha’s final birth as Ṛṣabha and his renunciation of the kingdom, 3) Bharata and Bāhubali’s fraternal dispute over control of their father’s kingdom and the subsequent renunciation and liberation of all the main characters including Bāhubali, Ādinātha, and finally Bharata. These sections map onto an emotional and spiritual evolution of the soul along a moral continuum that culminates in liberation. The first phase of the narrative, concerned with Ādinātha’s earlier and inherently less spiritually evolved births, is deeply invested in the experiences of the soul in the world, and, in particular, the heightened sensorium offered up by the figure of the king ensconced in his court. Maintaining the optic of kingship, Ādinātha’s final birth as Ṛṣabha telescopes the premise of these earlier births into a sustained and focused examination of a single life on the brink of liberation. The spiritual progression that leads to Ādinātha’s liberation is one marked by decreasing sexuality and desexualized human attachments. His earlier births are sites of love, eroticism, and sumptuary excess while in his later divine births sexual
pleasure occurs only in the mind and not with the body.\(^{428}\) As such, Ādinātha’s final birth as Rṣabha acts as a narrative pivot from the richly human experiences of his previous ten incarnations—of love, sex, laughter, and even grief—into a world increasingly structured around dispassion, its cultivation and realization. These three seemingly discreet narratological movements are, in fact, bound together through the affective ties of the central characters, perhaps better described as the central “souls” whose trajectories along the moral continuum occupy the narrative over the course of many births and rebirths. Here again, Pampa activates the world of the court for his own ends. As Whitney Cox observes, “Affectively charged relationships are seen as central to the substance of politics as it is represented within the narrative world of the poem.”\(^{429}\) It is through these affectively charged relationships of the court amplified into transmigratory relationships that Pampa brings to the fore the place of love and affection as determinate factors in human existence.\(^{430}\)

The considerable affective emphasis of Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam is not necessarily unique within Jain literature. The Jains were the great storytellers of medieval India, producing a vast amount of story literature, epic, and poetry. And yet despite the extant treasury of Jain narrative, it is not always clear what makes a story identifiably “Jain.” I

---

argue here that one readily distinguishable feature, and perhaps even one of the most effective features of Jain narrative, is its emotional ontology that yields a particular affective orientation in its subjects. Affect names a material disposition of bodies as distributed relationally in time and space. In the Jain case, the materiality of affective relationships is constituted by the accrual of emotional residue that binds souls together in a transmigratory bond that can last many lifetimes. Pampa quite literally describes love as binding through its stickiness (jigilta) and its cement-like quality (vajralēpa). The repetition of these affective transmigratory bonds is one of the most important, and yet unremarked upon, narratological features of Jain literature. To my knowledge, Phyllis Granoff is the only scholar to have made mention of the distinctiveness of this emotional ontology operational in Jain literature. She observes that,

…ties of affection, emotional relationships of love and hatred, extend beyond a single birth into potentially infinite rebirths. Past connections determine present relationships; there is an order to our connection with others that is determined by these past emotional ties. At the same time there is an unpredictability to our lives as social beings, for what repeats itself is the emotional bond, the bare fact of connectedness and not the relationship itself.

An emotional bond connects all of the main characters of the Ādipurāṇaṃ in and out of Ādinātha’s eleven births. As Granoff notes, the emotion itself, in this case, love or affection, is stable across lifetimes but the gendered, social, familial, professional, and physical relationships that it animates have endless permutations. In Ādinātha’s final

---

431 PĀP, v. 3.5{upalamāle} and vacana v. 6.19. Jigilta is an adjectival participle from the verb root jigil, which means “to be sticky, gummy, viscid, glutinous, adhesive, etc.” KED, 650.
433 Friedhelm Hardy anticipates Granoff’s work on this matter by pointing out that the shifting embodiments of the soul (as man, woman, father, or son) reflect the Jain philosophy of syādvāda, or the doctrine of many pointedness. He ultimately remarks that,
birth as Rṣabha, the souls who form the central characters of the narrative are born as his various sons and as Śrēyāṃsa, the dānatīrthakara, or the person who breaks the Tīrthaṅkara’s first fast as an ascetic. The assemblage of these particular souls happens many times throughout the text. For example, during Ādinātha’s fourth incarnation as King Vajrajaṅgha, Rṣabha’s sons Bharata, Bāhubali, Vṛṣabhasēna, and Anantavijaya were respectively born as Vajrajaṅgha’s chief minister Mativara, his military commander Akampana, and his priest Ānanda while Śrēyāṃsa was born as his wife Śrimati. In Ādinātha’s ninth birth as Vajranābhi, these same souls were born as his brothers Subāhu, Mahābāhu, Piṭha, Mahāpiṭha, and his merchant friend Dhanamitra. In Ādinātha’s tenth birth as Ahamindra, they too were born as Ahamindra gods. While I have highlighted here the interconnections of these five souls, the transmigratory network of souls in the Ādipurāṇa is far more expansive. From a Jain soteriological perspective, it seems that one’s karma is not the sole factor in determining one’s birth, but, in fact, emotional ties too play an important, if under-theorized role, in human causality as well as in the configuration of souls moving through transmigration together. As imagined in the Ādipurāṇa, and in Jain literature more broadly, transmigration is a surprisingly collective, rather than isolating experience. Within the Ādipurāṇa narrative tradition, Pampa most readily capitalizes on the aesthetic possibilities made available by such enduring affective bonds. This is not to suggest that these relational elements are not present in other renditions of the Ādipurāṇa narrative because they certainly are. However, in the hands

“It is easy to imagine what kind of wonderful stories the Jains themselves could have produced on the basis of syād-vāda. Unfortunately, none are known to me and I am not sure whether the Jain storytellers ever exploited it,” Friedhelm Hardy, The Religious Culture of India: Power, Love, and Wisdom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 542. Hardy clearly did not read enough Jain literature.

434 PĀP, vacana v. 4.89.
of Pampa the affective, romantic, and even erotic features of Ādinātha’s lives become a point of poetic elaboration.

The question that forms the sub-heading of this chapter, “caught in a bad romance?” plays upon the widely held perception that there is no positive place for love and sex within the Jain tradition. In our received notion of Jainism as ascetically oriented, love is not liberatory, but liberation’s antithesis. In an important article “Love, Violence, and the Aesthetics of Disgust: Śaivas and Jains in Medieval South India,” that builds upon the work of James Ryan, Anne Monius argues that sex and marriage as repetitious literary tropes in the Cīvakacintāmaṇi, and Tamil Jain literature more broadly, serve antithetically to guide the reader away from love and eroticism and towards dispassion and worldly renunciation. Or aesthetically speaking, the repetition of the aesthetized emotion of erotic love (śṛṅgāra)—from the hero Cīvakaṉ’s many marriages to the striking image of two monkeys fornicating—cultivates in the reader a sense of disgust (bībhatśa). For Monius, the import of an aesthetics of disgust is two-fold: it orients the reader towards the correct religious path of renunciation, but it also provides a satirical critique of other religious traditions, such as the Śaivas, for whom the affect of love was an important religious aesthetic. The case of love in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ is subtly, but importantly, quite different. As we will see, one’s affective ties to and in the world are still necessary to renounce, but human attachment—that often adheres through multiple lifetimes—is not inhibitory to liberation and can even enhance one’s position within the

cycle of transmigration.\textsuperscript{436} It turns out that romance, erotic love, and even affect more broadly aren’t so bad after all. Indeed, for medieval Deccani Jains, the repetitious tropes of love, sex, and sumptuary excess largely routed through the figure of the king do not engender disgust, but rather provide a heightened experience of the world that itself is necessary for liberation. As noted in the previous chapter, the logic that undergirds the Ādipurāṇa genre more broadly is that one must go through the world in order to get out of it.

The love between Lalitāṅga and his divine consort Svayaṃprabhe develops across multiple rebirths—as king and queen, king and prince/father and son, and king and minister—until Ādinātha’s eleventh and final birth as King Ṛṣabha and Svayaṃprabhe’s birth as Prince Śrēyāṃṣa. Here we see the traditional Sanskrit literary portrayal of a king as a romantically entangled figure upended in a Jain gender-bending cosmological narrative framework in which lovers are born into different familial and gendered configurations. I read Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe’s romance as the predominate narrative and affective hinge that ties together Ādinātha’s cycle of rebirths. Svayaṃprabhe’s erotic love serves to elevate her proximity to liberation through each successive birth even as the erotic quality of her love is transformed into an idiom of devotion. I argue that Pampa’s romantic attunement was not just an aesthetic choice born out of the necessity to include all the rasas in kāvyā, but in focusing on love Pampa also taps into a nascent feature of Digambara Jainism; love itself can have liberatory potential.

\textsuperscript{436} It is unclear to me how Pampa’s embrace of an aesthetic of erotic love or love more broadly played into the larger religious dynamics of the period—for example, instead of a critique as in the Tamil Jain case explored by Monius, could we perhaps read Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam as an accommodation or acquiescence to the importance of love within a Hindu bhakti milieu?
To understand just how love can orient a soul on the correct path of liberation in the Ādipurāṇaṃ requires a reader attentive to a narrative in which the souls are consistent, but the characters themselves are constantly changing. Here I will zero in on the story of Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe’s souls across the entirety of Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ. After his first two births as Jayavarmā and Mahābāla, Ādinātha’s soul takes on its third incarnation as the God Lalitāṅga in the Īśāna Heaven (īśānakalpa) in chapter two of the text. Svayaṃprabhe is his favorite queen and he refuses to separate from her for even a second. Pampa describes the connection between Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe:

She shines on his chest with a pleasing melodious sound.
Her melody is brand new /
Her emotion is brand new.
Positioned with low and high notes positioned in reverse coitus /
it comes forth when he repeatedly strokes her.
There is no mistake in the shining successions of notes /
There is no mistake in the shining succession of emotions.
When we compare them, Svayaṃprabhe, that expert in lovemaking, is equal to a vīna.

Here the dominate comparison is between Svayaṃprabhe and a vīna, but the implied second meaning is that the act of playing the vīna produces melodious music just as sex with Svayaṃprabhe produces aestheticized emotions. The more graphic suggestion underlying the verse is that the emergence of her melody/emotion is akin to an orgasm. And indeed, there is an explicitness to this verse—in its naming of rasa, in its description

\begin{verbatim}
437 PĀP, v. 2.62 \{campakamāle\}.
438 esederdeyol paḷaṅcuva kaladhvaniyim posatondu rāgamaṃ posayise sōṅkisōṅkidoḍe bandire nindadharōttaraṅgaḷoḷ misupa rasāntaraṅgaḷin eḍambaḍan āgade tam alo intu pō- lipoḍe pōlisalkedore viṇeyan ā suratapraṇānro ṯ || 2.77 \{campakamāle\}
\end{verbatim}
of sex—that runs counter to standard Sanskritic convention. Indeed, this verse is more explicitly sexual than general convention allowed (again problematizing the relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada poetics).\textsuperscript{439} However, in introducing us to the erotic love between Svayaṃprabhe and Lalitāṅga in explicit terms, Pampa avoids any ambiguity; this poem instructs its reader in the reality of love and sex beyond aesthetics in a textual world structured by transmigration.

The bond of love between Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe that develops in the Īśāna Heaven comes to crisis in chapter three when Lalitāṅga becomes aware of his imminent demise, at which point he implores Svayaṃprabhe,

Together they reached the limit of happiness, were satiated by the nectar of sex, and were united in the stickiness of love.

“Even though we have two bodies, how is there just one breath? Oh, Svayṃprabhe! Please explain this.

It impossible for me to love and enjoy you without stopping this demon, called the Lord of Death, from unjustly dragging me away.”\textsuperscript{440}

This verse employs a shifting grammatical perspective not uncommon in Pampa’s writing.\textsuperscript{441} The first two lines are descriptive statements composed in the third person. The remainder of the verse is composed in a mix of unmarked first and second person.

\textsuperscript{439} Ali, \textit{Courtly Culture}, 212.

\textsuperscript{440} santasadanteydīsuratāmṛtadotānidalkaṟoḷjigiltantirepatimeygaueraḍadōmēnāsuvondēnōḷpoḍembantarēkūrtyninnoḍanebhōgisalīyadekemmanennanuvvantakanembaṭūtanēlebārisalāgadepēḷsvayamprabhe || 3.5 \{utpalamāle\}

Here the quotative participle \textit{endu} occurs at the start of the following \textit{vacana} as is common in Pampa’s poetry.

\textsuperscript{441} See for example the passage quoted below in this chapter in which Vajrajaṅgha views Śrimati’s painting. The opening of this prose passage is written in the first person and the second part switches to the third person; “In this way, these memories are a few of the hidden signs between me and that woman, but they are not painted here. Then Vajrajaṅga was impaled by the point of the flower arrow of the God of Love: he became wide-eyed, eyelashes unblinking, eyebrows beautifully raised, the confusion of the mind evident, and awash in strong sweat,” \textit{PĀP}, \textit{vacana} v. 4.13.
The effect of this shifting grammatical person serves to establish the reader in a given reality (of the couple’s happiness, sex, and love), although through the distanced perspective of the third person. The first and second person move the reader into a perspective of heightened intensity and intimacy of Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe’s relationship. Through the exploration of this relationship, we get an explicit account of the materiality of emotion and its effects. We are first told that the couple is “united in the stickiness of love” (aḻkarōḷ jigiltantire patti). In the very next line, Lalitāṅga asks Svayaṃprabhe to explain how they maintain two bodies, but a single breath (maiygal eraḍādoḍam ēn asuvonde nōḻpoḍembantire). The implication is that the sticky materiality of love inexplicably fuses their two bodies into one. The verse suggests that the prospect of unbinding their bodies brings with it the possibility of intense grief. Yet, as we will see, embodied love is ephemeral in comparison to the enduring incorporeal love between souls.

Delirious at his impending separation from Svayaṃprabhe, Lalitāṅga is consoled by his fellow gods. They explain that his current condition is not unique to him alone, but is, in fact, the condition of all gods. Not even divine ladies can avoid the God of Death. The gods, in classic Pampa style, end by rhetorically asking, “In the cycle transmigration, is there any who is not burnt by the fire of birth, death, old age, disease, and grief? Does a shelter exist other than dharma?442 So inspired, Lalitāṅga worships the Jina and falls from

---

442 PĀP, v. 3.6 {mahāśragdhare}. 
Heaven.\textsuperscript{443} He is reborn as Prince Vajrajaṅgha, the son of Vasundhare and Vajrabāhu, king of Utpalakhēta.

Meanwhile, after Lalitāṅga’s death, Svayaṃprabhe is utterly dejected, left all alone in heaven;

\begin{quote}
When Lalitāṅga left, her curly hair became empty of Mandāra flowers.
Her cheeks were empty of the head-dress’s leaves.
Her forehead was empty of ornamentation.
Her breasts were empty of a necklace.
Her buttocks were empty of a jingling girdle
Her two feet were empty of musical anklets.
For her, the entirety of heaven was empty of the eternal forest.\textsuperscript{444}
\end{quote}

Pampa describes Svayaṃprabhe through the classic Sanskrit literary tropes of a woman experiencing love in separation (\textit{vipralambha srṅgāra}), classed in the \textit{Nāṭyaśāstra} and in later \textit{kāma} treatises as a heroine distressed by separation (\textit{virhotkanṭhitā nāyikā}).\textsuperscript{445} The grief produced by the separation from her lover manifests on the body through the inversion of standardized accouterments of a refined woman. In grief, her body is literally emptied (signaled through the repeated repetition of the word \textit{śūnya}) of the sumptuary items that enhance her beauty and mark her status. Through this verse, Pampa suggests that without love there is literally emptiness.

\begin{quote}
Just as Lalitāṅga implored Svayaṃprabhe, she too cries out for him;

The Lord of Death dragged and carried you away.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{443} Both Śvētāmbara and Digambara Jain literature describes characters’ souls as “falling” between one life and the next. The soul presumably falls because of the physical weight of \textit{karma}.

\textsuperscript{444} alakaṃ mandāraśūnyaṃ kadapu makarikāpatraśūnyaṃ lalāṭaṃ
tilakālkāraśūnyaṃ ghanakucayugālam hārasūnyaṃ nitambaṃ |
kalakāncidāmaśūnyaṃ caranayugalamuṃ nūpurālāpaśūnyaṃ
lalitāṅgamaṃ pōdoḍāytākege divam anitum nirjarāraṇaśūnyaṃ || 3.13 \textit{mahāśragdhare}

He put an end to you. While I was staring intently at you, you disappeared, but somehow my soul exits in this beautiful body. And yet this body did not disappear, and yet is not under my control. Look! Lalitāṅga! If you do not return from wherever you are, then my mind will dissolve into grief.
Where is he, sword of passion that is the God of Love?
Where is he, mirror of the incorporeal God of Love?
Where is he, gold mine of pleasure? Where is he, clever man?
Where is he, source of merriment? Where is he, abode of loveliness?
Where is he, husband of desire? Where is the beloved of Lalitāṅga, my king, love of my heart?

In this pathos-inducing lament, Svayaṃprabhe explores the unfathomability of death. She simply cannot wrap her head around it. The inexplicability of Lalitāṅga’s demise, the disappearance of his body, is all the more baffling given that her own body did not disappear at the same time. Svayaṃprabhe’s exclamation over her lack of control over whether her body stays or goes poetically highlights the profoundly mystifying experience of being an embodied soul trapped in the cycle of rebirth. Overcome by grief, she pleads for Lalitāṅga to return from the unknown and repeatedly demands to know where he has gone. While Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe’s love-in-separation adheres to the classic tropes of Sanskrit literature, its origins lie outside the canon’s generic expectations. Their separation lies not in the contrived narratological circumstances of a curse or a shipwreck that we so commonly see in Sanskrit kāvyā, but in the universal experience of death. Indeed, what greater love-in-separation can two lovers endure? This

446

muṟideḻeduyye ninnan iradantakan āṁ naĉe nōĊe nōĊe nīṁ
karagideyentum enna suśarîradoḷ irdudu jīvam āyoĊal
karagidudilladenna basam altoĊal indema śōkadoḷ manaṁ
karagidudeyde vārādiyirdeyėṁ lalitāṅgavallabhā || 3.14 {campakamāle}
madanana khaiduvellidān anangana kaipoĊeyellidaṁ vilā-sada kaňỹeyellidaṁ cadura puṭṭadana ellidaṁ vinō-dada modal ellidaṁ sobagināgaram ellidaṁ icceyānman e-llidan erdegārman ennarasu ellidanō lalitāṅgavallabhaṁ || PĀP, 3.15 {campakamāle}
existentially loaded rendering of love-in-separation occurs again and again between the
central souls of the Ādipurāṇa. Such beautiful stagings and restagings of separation serve
to render them banal within the framework of the final separation that is liberation. The
separation of lovers versus spiritual emancipation is qualitatively different and inhabits
different affective tonalities. Despite this clear difference, I want to suggest that these two
forms of separation may, in fact, be related. Repeated separation as an effect of
transmigration reconciles the readers to its reality, in effect priming us for liberation.
Thus, although not identical, the structure of feeling that informs the text’s repetitious
separations scales up to inform its final separation. This scalar affective subsumption
transforms vipralambha sr̥ṅgāra into a preparatory emotional experience for spiritual
emancipation.

Exactly mirroring Lalitāṅga’s experience at the end of his heavenly existence,
Svayaṃprabhe is approached by fellow divine women. They chide her, saying;

In both the past and the future, is it like this for all divine couples.
So why are you grieving like this? Oh! What foolishness!
Worship the Lord Jina whole-heartedly
and you will be reunited with your beloved in the next life. 447

The words of these divine ladies, admonishing or even flippant in tone, have quite
profound implications. Much like in the second chapter in which kingship was figured as
the fruit of Jain dharma, here too the fruit of Jain worship is reunited love; for Pampa,
Jainism is reparative of erotic love. The worldly benefits of Jain practice seem antithetical
to the otherworldly goal of liberation, but in the same way that kingship can form a path

447

muṃ pintembudidinte ni-
liṃpa yagakkellam intu bāyālīvude chiḥ |
gāṃpu bagegoṇdu jinapati-
yāṃ pūjisu paḍeveyiniyanaṁ maṟubhavadoḷ || PĀP, 3.16 {kanda}.
to renunciation so too can love be liberatory or, at the very minimum, karmically advantageous. Pampa, like Jinasēna before him, creates an imaginative space in which intense relations to the world, and, more precisely, the romantic attunements of courtly culture, are be made functional for Jain religious practice.

The emotional resonances of Lalitāṅga and Svayamprabhe’s divine relationship persist into the human realm: Vajrajaṅgha still feels an unexplainable, lingering love for Svayamprabhe, whose current birth he is unaware. The dashing and handsome Vajrajaṅgha is tormented in separation;

How much will his youth increase through the happiness that is the passionate pleasure of the God of Love? And yet he did not care at all for earth’s pleasures.

Remembering the beauty of the Nandana forest full of wish-fulfilling trees and the beauty of the full-moon face of Svayamprabhe, he reproached the happiness of the divine world.

In that way, he became crazed and desired the flower in the sky like a mad man inflamed with passion. He intensely remembered that Svayamprabhe, for so long the source of all that was experienced in the world of the gods.

Even when many beautiful women flashing like lightening arrived that prince did not desire them. They grew bewildered.

A bee tastes the intense fragrance of a coral blossom garland. If it lives without nectar, it becomes deceived by hunger. After that, will it surrender its body to the pleasure of another flower?\textsuperscript{448}

\textsuperscript{448} enitenitāda javvanam anaṅgavikāravinōdiyakkum antitanitanī mahītāda bhōgamanollade tatsvayamprabhānana sakalēndu bimbaramaṇīyamanakṣayakalpavrksanadanavanaramyamaṇ nenedu dūṛjisidāṃ suralōkā saukhyamaṇ || 3.11\{campakamāle\} antu gaganakusumamane bayasi maṟaldu maṟuguvu maruṇanante dēvalōkadō initānuṃ kālam anubhavisidanubhavakke modaligeyenisidāsvayamprabhēyam nenenenedu—
vacana kuḍumincim masedannar appa palar oluṇḍir marulgonḍu bandoḍam ā rājakumāran ollane dālan mandārikāmāle yō kuḍugampaṇ savidondu tumbi pasivim mēḷpaṭṭu baṇḍunṇadipōḍam irkuṃ baljiṃtum anyakusum āmōdakkemey darkumē || \textit{PĀP}, 3.12 \{matēbha\}. 
Vajrajaṅgha refuses to give into the expectations of his royal position and the sensual advantages of his beautiful body; he remembers only Svayaṃprabhe and, to their great dismay, refuses the amorous advances of gorgeous women. Vajrajaṅgha is analogized to a ravenous bee—can he or the bee resist the temptation of gratification if it means betraying one’s true love? Like all of the questions that so often grace the final lines of Pampa’s verses, the reader already knows the answer; there is no other flower for Vajrajaṅgha than the soul of Svayaṃprabhe.

Back in the Īśāna Heaven, following the advice of the divine ladies, Svayaṃprabhe meditates on the five supreme beings of the Jain tradition (pañcaparamēṣthis) and descends from heaven. In her death, Pampa reflectively ponders, “Indeed, if she does not follow him, will her love for Lalitāṅga not break?” Pampa, again in his persistently dense often double negatively inflected questions, seems to suggest that Svayaṃprabhe could somehow choose to not follow Lalitāṅga to his next birth. But, of course, we already know that their souls are materially bound in such a way that true separation is possible only in liberation. Moreover, through this question and the other textual signals explored above, the reader knows that Lalitāṅga and Svayaṃprabhe will, indeed, be reunited in their next birth. Unsurprisingly then, Svayaṃprabhe is born as Śrimati, the daughter of Lakṣmīmati and Vajradanta, king of Puṇḍarīkiṇi in the same human realm as Vajrajaṅgha.

Śrimati—now Śrimati—experiences love-sickness without a clear human object; she is unaware that Lalitāṅga is now born as Vajrajaṅgha. Relaxing in her bedroom, she hears the approach of a flying god and steps onto the balcony. Upon seeing

\[449\] PĀP, v. 3.17 \{utpalamāle\}.

\[450\] Ibid., vacana 3.17.
the god, she immediately becomes aware of her previous existences. She is able to remember Lalitāṅga and their life together in heaven. Once again (although this time in a new body) she cries out for her beloved and falls in a faint. Her female friends and servants manage to wake her, but Śrimati has gone mute. Her parents implore her to tell them what has happened, but she will not utter a single word. Only the nursemaid Paṇḍite manages to get the truth out of her and Śrimati narrates all of her previous births including her relationship with Lalitāṅga. She creates a painting based on her memories of their previous life together.

Chapter four commences with Paṇḍite displaying Śrimati’s painting at a local Jain temple where Vajrajaṅgha happens to see it; he subsequently recognizes the events as memories from his previous life.

The beauty of the emotions of love was variously expressed in that picture.
It depicted beautiful women in succession.
The combination of colors produced a vivid splendor.
These beautiful heights and depths achieved great beauty.
Is it even possible for the God Brahma to draw like this?”
So he thought. He marveled at the skillfulness in the painter’s art. Eyes wide with intense curiosity, he stared and contemplated it for a long time.
“Its beauty is a marvel. Just like that, is the beauty of the abode of Amarēndra.
Like this, certainly, is the beauty of the palace of the gods.
This is the beauty of the troop of the gods.
In this way, beauty engulfed these many divine women.
This flood of beauty is certainly the beauty of the gods and goddesses.
Tell me, has such beauty been seen before?”
He thought like that. Then, as if remembering a dream seen the previous night, he intensely remembered the supreme experience of pleasure that was the source of power in the divine world.
“Oh! Now, I understand that this heaven painted here is the Íśāna heaven.

\[\text{PĀP, vv. 3.22-3.24 \{campakamāle, vacana, utpalamāle, vacana, and matēbha\}.}\]

\[\text{Another common relationship that occurs between the verse and the prose, is that the verse will contain direct speech/thought and the vacana will contain the quotes and the expression “He spoke in this way” or “He thought in this way.” This style occurs frequently in this selection.}\]
This divine palace with the moving and fluttering flag
is the Śriprabha palace.
Those playful lotus faces
are the assembly of the gods.
Those glittering beauties, shining with mirth
are the beautiful divine women-folk.
This is my former incarnation that was celebrated as the God Lalitāṅga.
When I saw that Svayaṃprabhe,
eyes passively moving to and fro with intoxication,
I knew, without fail, this woman was certainly my chief queen.
This picture is a product of her artistic skill.
Tell me, would this even be possible for another person?
This garden of entangled divine Punnāga and Nāga trees
surrounded and encircled my palace.
Oh! Do I see a creeper bower there?
Didn’t we have sex on that man-made mountain?
How did it become this beautiful?
The abode of golden lotuses is my play pond.
Singing until the tune of the Hindōḷa raga was complete,
she ascended this play swing.
It is my manifestation who is swinging her.
Then this flower pavilion appeared and we entered a solitary place.
I accidentally said the wrong woman’s name
and experienced the pummel of her flower garland
and the kick of her left foot, which caused her anklet to charmingly jingle.”

When the divine assembly was in the royal court, we touched and joined such that she
decorated half of my lion-throne. Waving fly-whisks with the richness of the wind,
the divine women fanned that seated beauty. Within her mass of curly hair, a single
lock shook with pleasure. She put right the delicate flowers that were falling. I loved
even that action set to the sweet songs of the divine women. I also loved the playful
gesture that corrected her Pārijāta flower earrings, which slipped off with the shaking
of her head. Inside of a thicket of golden banana plants, in a jeweled temple,
accompanied by a small entourage, she sat down and repeatedly touched me until my
mind sang. It is possible to see on the painted cloth, her beautiful form playing the
vīna, worshipping Acyutēndra, and playing and wandering in the valleys of the
Mandara mountains. But, there was just one thing...
She experienced anger and jealousy with the agitation of sexual passion.
Oh! The chiding glance of her side eye.
Oh! Flying forth from her blue lotus garland,
petals struck my body.
“Please tell me, what is it?” We fought.
The picture of my beloved wife beating me is definitely not here.

453 Calling a woman by the wrong name is listed by Vātsyāyana as one of the causes for a lover’s quarrel. Wendy Doniger and Sudhir Kakir, trans. Vastyayana Kamasutra (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73.
And, once in the jeweled bedroom, she would become subdued from the deep lover’s quarrel.
Then she grew angry, “I bear your lotus feet on my head.”
I said, “Beloved, try to understand.”
She said, “My name is not beloved. Make me understand
if a woman by that name exists.
“You alone belong to that name. What other woman has made a vow to me?”
Soothingly her thus, she became calm. I embraced beauty.
Not even a trace of that deer-eyed woman is in this painting.
And once, in a dressing room illuminated by the light of the five jewels.
I alone decorated Svayaṃprabhe.
Mounted on top on top of me,
the dancing curtain of curls prevented me from seeing her lotus face.
She was angered when I told her, “They are hitting me.”
Without fixing the golden flowers in her hair,
I started to draw a picture with musk cream on her shining cheek.
How could she forget to include the beauty of this scene?
And, once, in the garden of the palace, slowly swaying from the wind, flower
c blossoms burst forth from a rich, fresh garden bed. It was impossibly beautiful. In the
subjection of the friction of love making, the slender female surrendered to me. She
felt proud and left.
She disappeared. So I lovingly bowed to a wish-fulfilling creeper
that I mistook for my beautifully limbed lady.
She angrily said, “How did you bow down to the other creeper
thinking it to be me, a lady with beautiful creeper like limbs?
Cowled, I bowed to Svayamprabhe, the beautifully limbed lady.
As there was love for that creeper
so too is there love between me and that real creeper-lady.
In this way, these memories are a few of the hidden signs between that woman and
me, but they are not painted here. Then Vajrajaṅga was impaled by the point of the
flower arrow of the God of Love: he became wide-eyed, eyelashes unblinking,
eyebrows beautifully raised, the confusion of the mind evident, and awash in strong
sweat. The beauty from her flickering side glances became the brush.
My beloved painted the story of the god of love, that is, the incidents of love. It is all in the book
of my mind as if just freshly written.\(^{454}\)

\(^{454}\) rasabhāvaṅgaḷ āda celvu nuḍivantādalakarim nōduvan-
tusirvantirudu rēkke kōmalateyam tāldittu varṇakramaṇaṁ
rasavatkāntiyam āntu nindudesem ī nimnōntaṅgaḷ virā-
jise celvaṁ gegeṇḍavintu bareyal brahmaṅgam ēm barkumē || 4.4 \{matēba\}
endu munnāṁ vicitracitvardyākaṁśalam anatikutūlōttārtīlokanān āgī niḍuṁ bhāvisi
nōdī—vacana
idaṇa andam bisavadam intidamarēndrāvāsadondam in-
tidu dal dēvāmānānadam idu dēvānīkāndondam in-
tidu dēvāṅganeyar palar balasikoṇḍirondam ī taṭarūp-
 idu dal dēvana dēviyandam idu pēl munnellī kaṇḍamāmo || 4.5 \{matēba\}
endu bagedu irukkoṇda kanasam marudevasam nenevante niratisayasuralōkavibhavasamudbhavasukhānubhavaman āgāle nenenenedu—vacana
ele bageden īgaḷ ī bareda kalpam īsānām ī
calalluḷitakētanaṃ suravimāṇāṃ ā śrīprabhaṃ saflavanārāvindam idu dēvāvṛndam īsā
dvilāsadarahāsaram idu divyakāntājanam ī 4.6 {prthvi}
idandu lalitāṅgadēvan ene sanda madrūpam ī madalasavilōḷalōcane dal ena mādēvi ta-
ppadi lalane tatsvayamprabheyē nōlpoḍi citram in-
tidākeyade balme pēṣ pēṣargam īntuṭondakkumē ī 4.7 {prthvi}
idennaya vimānāmaṃ balasi taḷa punnāganā-
gadivyatarunandanāṃ lateya jōmpam ī tōṛpudē-
n idalte neredirvar īrda kṛtakācalan chai vacan a-
pipidēṃ kanakapadāminīlāyayena līḷāsaram ī 4.8 {prthvi}
 idu līlāndōḷam īndōḷāṃ dani neṛṛgoṇvannegaṃ īṇdal īndō-
ridām tē菡tuttum idennaya pariṃjīduvē māḍhavimaṇṭapān tō-
purūḍiandēṅkāntadōḷ īūpurāvavīlasadvāmapadaphāra-
kkidārōḷ pakkāge gōṭraskhalana negale pūmāleyiṃ mōduветtem ī 4.9 {mahāśragdhare}
mattam amarasamiti verasōḷagaṃ gōṭṭhirdalilīmadīyasimhasanārdhakādeśaṃ ālaṅkarisi
dēvavedēnu sōṅki kūḷḷidāroḷum āmarāṅganeyē bīṣuva cămara āghāyalarmi
alugāva bamba gurulgaḷa bambaḥmandāṃ tāḷarva cinnapogāḷan avayavadoḷe īsaytūmdēva
keytamumāṃ amārāmādharājānāmākāṃ ārālādā śiṛākhampadoḷ īnīsanāṃ ēragidā
kāṅṇāpūrāpārījātastabakāman īśarisuva vilāsāmaṃ mānakaṅdaṅvāṅnādaṅga
māṇīmayabhavāndolage parimitaparijanasahitam ena manam ārālvinegam
ennasōṅkisōṅkinoḷ kūḷḷidāroḷū māḍaṅgāv diṣṭaṃ dēvēn īṭē pēḷēvēm-
budan īnē kāḍī mōḍidāvinaṃ īndōḷāṃ īlālā īṭē ērē nōntaḷ āvaḷ ēmbudē ī paṭadoḷ mṛgākṣiya ī
4.10 {campakamaḷē}
mattam orme māṇīmayasurabhabhavāndolage nirbharaṃayaḷakalāharavāṣēyāṅgī—
vacana
mulidīre pādaṇāṅkājanānāṃ tāleyōḷ nilē tāḷī lallāḷē
tiliyēnē lallāḷē emba pesar allemāgaśe pārākeyuḷloḍi m
tilipēnē māṭ tē pesarē nēn irē nōntal īval ēmbudēn
ūḷ timārjavaddipidandaṃ āṇaṃ illa ī dēvēdādōḷ mṛkāṣiḷā ī 4.11 {campakamaḷē}
mattam orme pāṭcaratnaprābhārasādītapaṛṣadāhanasāleyōḷ svaṃprabheyē āne
pasadanaṅgolusuttum īrdu—vacana
calāḍalakāḷī nīna vadanāmbujamāṃ naḍē nōḍēl īyada-
vavivalsvuduaparāṅkōḷum īnaṇān īnēdudu kāṇḍu līnēpū-
gāḷan ādārōḷ tagulcēdē mṛgōdbhavapaṅkēda prataraṅghamāṇa
ōḍīpa māṇīdapōḷēn bāreḷum bāreyāl māṛdendāṃ ēvūḍō ī 4.12 {campakamaḷē}
mattam orme māṇḍapavanāṅāṃpāṅkāḷaṃhāparavāsēyāṅgī
kusumadesāḷa mīṣaṇaḥ posaṣēṣeyōḷ asadāḷam ēseyē basayēsī posayēsī
This lengthy passage is divided into two discreet narrative moments. In the first moment, Pampa describes Vajrajaṅgha’s wonder at viewing the painting and the various scenes that prompt him to recognize his former life, former beloved, and former self. The world of Śrimati’s painting is one filled with divine assemblies, royal courts, palaces, beautiful women, swings, music, gardens, creeper bowers, sex on artificial hills and in flower pavilions, and delicate gestures that a woman makes to adjust the ornaments on her body.

For all its beauty, the world captured by the painting is a somewhat static vision of an idealized courtly milieu. The passage pivots perspectives at vacana v. 4.9 with the Kannada word onde, the word for “one” with an added emphatic ending, which I have translated as “But there was just one thing…” This form coming at the end of a prose passage creates a pregnant pause before the start of the next verse, quite literally marking a literary shift. While Vajrajaṅgha clearly relishes the memories that Śrimati’s painting evokes, he notes—to great comedic effect—that his former wife has rewritten, or rather repainted, history, strategically leaving out their more intensely fraught interactions. The second moment of the passage focuses on their intimate lives as lovers. Through their

posasulisamasakadabasado| basada| āgiyum asiyal| enagasavasado|le besedu pōgi—vacana
maregole pūtakalpalateyam lalitāngiye getta lampinindicaguvudum latāngi muliśim lateyam latāngigettu nīn ēragideyenna pakkade pērlaingen berce latāngigam āgal ā n ēregiden ādudā lateyn accigam intenagaṃ latāngigam | 4.13 {campakamāle}
itivu modalāge pēranvānkeyavīnaṇāṅgaṃ kelakelavu bareduvillendanākṛṣṭadṛṣṭiprasaranum acaḷitapakṣmavisaranum akamputabhṛūvibhramanum prakāṣitacittavibhramanum atiprabhalaprasvēdajalaprasālītananuṃ kusumaśaraśalākākāḷītananuṃ āgi—vacana
tarāḷāpāṅgavilāsa—sphuritame lekkaṇikeyāgi nallal munnaṃ baredataucaritam īgal baredatirdapudu mannaḥpustakado| || PA, 4.14 {kanda}
erotic dynamic, Vajrajaṅgha remembers Śrimati as inhabiting a wide range of emotions including arousal, anger, jealousy, pride, vulnerability, and, of course, love. They fight with words and through beatings with flower garlands. She sexually dominates him on top and yet surrenders to him in the heat of passion. Vajrajaṅgha’s highly erotic—even graphic—perspective deeply enriches the couple’s interpersonal dynamic beyond the generic perspective of the painting while, at the same time, infusing the erotic with the comedic. After all, sex is funny and a site rife with the possibility of human error, as the scene of Śrimati’s curls pelting Vajrajaṅgha in the face during sex attests. Vajrajaṅgha’s interpretation animates the artificial world of the painting, but it also suggests that their relationship had more variegated affective and emotional tonality beyond what a generic pictorial scene could render or what Śrimati allowed herself to remember. The different perspectives of the painting and its interpretation allow Pampa to capture this emotional variegation.

If we take a step back from the finer details of the plot and consider the poetics of the many verses cited above within the framework of the larger narrative, what is so remarkable are the ways in which Pampa employs kāvya’s standard romantic tropes within a Jain transmigratory romance. For example, in Pampa we find the stock narratemes of lovers’ contrived separation, a case of confused identities, and reunion through the aid of a painting. Each one of these narrative bits occurs in Harṣa’s Ratnāvalī (c. 7th c.) in which the heroine Ratnāvalī is married sight unseen to King Udāyana, but is separated from him in a tragic shipwreck as she journeys to his kingdom. She is then rescued, renamed Sāgarikā, and employed as a lady in waiting to Udāyana’s chief queen. Through a series of hijinks, Ratnāvalī paints Udāyana’s portrait to which a friend adds
Ratnāvalī/ Sāgarikā’s own likeness. Of course, Udāyana sees this painting, falls in love with the unknown woman Ratnāvalī/ Sāgarikā, and, eventually, they are united. The Ādipurāṇa narrative adapts and subsumes these preexistent narratemes found throughout classical Sanskrit literature, and it is these very narratemes that Pampa poetically elaborates. In Pampa’s hands, the adaption of these preexistent Sanskrit literary forms to new ideological content intensifies the former workings of the trope itself. Lovers’ separation, confused identities, and reunion through the production of art are made existential; they are no longer merely poetic convention, but occur because of the cycle of transmigration. And yet the deeply religious poignancy of these events is only activated if the reader inhabits a Jain soteriological perspective.

Pampa’s emulation of Sanskritic norms extends beyond the unit of the narrateme and into the standardized depictions of characters and landscapes. For example, in the above scenarios, Pampa depicts Svayaṃprabhe/Śrimati through the various guises of archetypical Sanskritic heroines; she commences in the Īśāna Heaven as a woman primed for sexual union (rāsakasajja), is transformed into a woman distressed by separation from her lover (virhotkaṇṭhitā), through the memories of the painting we see her as a woman whose husband is entranced (svādhīnabhartya), and finally as an enraged lover (khaṇḍitā). Through the ruse of the painting, Lalitāṅga/Vajrajaṅgha and Svayaṃprabhe/Śrimati are again reunited and married. Their reunion restarts the cycle of heroines and Śrimati again appears as a woman primed for sexual union (rāsakasajja):

Described in this way, their attachment grew strong. They emanated a magnetic union, a pleasure beyond measure, and an abundant love. Their minds were immersed in the nectar of many different types of sexual sports. The God of Love himself

---

455 Vincent Lefèvre, Portraiture in Early India: Between Transience and Eternity (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 44.
became their teacher, instructing them in the various pleasurable movements. Inside the garden, the abode of golden bananas trees became their dwelling place. And decorated with abundant drops of honey from spring flowers torn by the weight of the roaming bumble bees, the surfaces of the expansive sandbanks became the site of their relaxation. And resounding with a vīna like humming from the buzzing group of bees delighted by the fragrant intoxicating nectar oozing from the blossomed lotus garden, the lakes became their excellent abodes of watersport. And bewildered by the uproar from the flocks of cuckoo birds and intoxicated bees eating the buds of the perpetually blooming mango-blossoms, the man-made stony peaks made for the purpose of play became their mansions visible from all the directions. And surrounded by sandalwood forests shaking from the slow, sweet-smelling, cool wind which also playfully flitting across the lakes filled with a mass of succulent lotuses, the paths became their terrain for roaming. And bursting forth during the spring, the flower shoots became their shining decorations of forest sport. And purified in the three worlds, the sacred great Jina temple became their abode furnished with colorful embellishments for worship with preeminent devotion. The performance of charity to a worthy person became their pleasure. In a continuous festival, their days passed like this.…

This long prose passage immerses us in the landscape of Vajrajaṅgha and Śrimati’s erotic union. Their erotic love, unsurprisingly, occurs across spaces well established for the purposes of love making such as lakes used for watersport (jaḷakēḷī), artificial mountains

constructed for the purpose of playful sexual romps (kṛtakēḷī), and forests used for woodland trysts (vanakēḷī). Pampa’s description of this landscape maintains a particular grammatical symmetry. The description of each distinct site—the banana grove, sandbanks, lakes, etc.—ends with āgeyum, the infinitive form of the verb “to be” (āge) with the samuccaya aggregative suffix “um.” And the effect is, indeed, cumulative; their love occurs here, and here, and here, and endlessly so on and so forth only to culminate in a Jain temple. Through a list of conventional sites for romance, Pampa leads us to a much less conventional place. In blending the erotic and the devotional within the same poetic passage—grammatically linking them through the samuccaya—Pampa posits both sex and Jain worship as features of a cultivated courtly self.

The connection between sexual and religious activity is further emphasized in this verse:

The heavenly pleasures they experienced together in their previous birth in the Divijēndra abode reoccurred here in this birth. They remembered their former existence. They associated one with another. Again, with extreme joy, they vowed to experience mortal pleasure. In whatever manner and without end, how much merit did the great Śrimatī and Vajrajaṅgha accrue?!457

The sexual pleasure of Svayamprabhe and Lalitāṅga—when he stroked her like a vīna—is reduplicated in their current birth as Śrimati and Vajrajaṅgha. Indeed, Pampa tells us that they observed a vow (from the noun nōntu) to experience worldly pleasure (martyabhōga). Within Pampa’s writing, and in Kannada more broadly, the word nōntu is

457 divijēndrāvāsadoḷ munnoḍane divijabhōgoṅalāṃ bhōgisirdī-bhavadoḷ bandilla jātismarar ene neredōrvaroḷ mattam atyu-tsavadindaṃ martyabhōgaṅgalan anubhavisal nōntar intūgaḷ entuṃ tavadantēṃ pūnyamaṃ pūnjisidaro piriduṃ śrīmatīvajrajaṅghar || PĀP, 4.61 {mahāśragdhare}
typically reserved for religious devotional activity and, as such, carries an explicitly religious connotation. By invoking the concept of nōntu in a decidedly different context, Pampa again resists an opposition between the religious and the worldly. He carries this point through into the question in the final line about how much merit the couple has accrued. Again, if we interpret the question’s subtext, Pampa points to the fact that to be repeatedly united and to experience immense pleasure indicates that this couple has done something right to accrue such merit. Through different poetic angles, Pampa again and again reiterates that religious activity and its karmic consequences are bound to the experience of love and sexual pleasure.

The connection that Pampa makes between Jain religion and eroticism reaches its logical conclusion when Vajrabāhu, Vajrajaṅgha’s father, renounces his kingdom. After becoming a naked Digambara muni, Pampa describes Vajrabāhu’s sole goal as “the side glances of the Lakṣmī of liberation [mokṣalakṣmīkaṭākṣaikalakṣya].” Here we have the curious image of a monk, naked and asexual as a newborn baby, in pursuit of liberation personified as the amorous Goddess Śrī. The goddess is an erotic woman and Vajrabāhu, even in his monastic form, longs for her side glances (kaṭākṣa) just as any romantic hero would. It is difficult to know what to do with or how to read such poetry of erotic asceticism. However, the fundamental point remains: a Jain monk desires liberation, the very goal of renunciation. Pampa poetically exploits the fact that liberation is, in fact, only legible through desire. In rethinking the theological through poetry, Pampa intimates that the structure of feeling that animates a desire for liberation is fundamentally erotic even if it works to undo that eroticism.

458 Here the word for “naked” (jātarūpadhara) in reference to a Digambara Jain monk literally means “bearing the form of birth.”
Even as the erotic ushers out King Vajrabāhu it persists in Vajrajāṅgha’s royal assumption. In chapter five, Vajrajāṅgha is crowned as king and luxuriates with Śrimati in all the lifestyle pleasures that kingship has to offer:

In this way, they passed many years. One day, during the night, at a spot on the earth filled with priceless emerald jewels, with brilliantly painted walls protected by pairs of gods, khācharas, and kinnaras, with an abundance of fragrant smelling smoke from black āgaru incense, in the darkness repelled by the light of the jeweled lamp, with a decorated golden cot—legs constructed from a variety of jewels—, on the beautiful surface of the bed were pillows with both sides colorfully covered with pure fine cloth like the foam of the milk ocean, in the abode of the house of great beauty, there was that couple, eyes half closed from the pleasure of the mutual touch of the limbs. As if like that, they were trapped by a desire for sleep. Meanwhile, without knowing the strength of the sunstone incense pot, the bedroom attendant, opened up the smoke of the black āgaru used for hair cleaning. She forgot to open the covered emerald door panels of the round window for ventilation.

At first, the smoke manifested itself, emerged, and then spread. It became unrelentingly thick. It did not diminish with this approach. It covered everything until it inhibited breath. It prompted that couple to embrace and to wonder at the world.
The heap of smoke from the black āgaru incense killed like a black snake. It smoked continuously. These lovers in life did not loosen their arms. Then, letting go of life, they died together. Is there any greater merit than this?
The smoke of black āgaru became one limb of pleasure that spreads and kills. In this way, they experienced the pleasures of the cycle of birth and death that are the poison of a snake’s hood / that are the poison of pleasure.
That human couple repeatedly experienced much pleasure and much enjoyment. In that moment, they themselves reached another place. How do intelligent people believe after describing transmigration?
The shining lamp’s flame disappears Their souls bodily exit was like darkness spreading in the house. Their glittering beautiful bodies disappeared into the darkness.459

459 antanēkasanvatsaraṅgaḷ salvinam ondu divasaṃ rajanīsamayadoḷ anarghyamarakatamanisīlāsampāditamēdinībhāgadol amarakhacarakinnaramithunasanāthacittabhittivirājitadol atibahuḷakāḷāgarudhāpadhūmāmōdadol ativisadamānipradhipikōdyōtadūrīkṛtattamastamadol anēkaratnacitatipādudkavinyastakāṅcanamancōpaśōbhitadol
The couple’s previous vow to experience mundane pleasure ultimately does them in. The point is clear, pleasure derived from the trappings of royal life—be it palaces, jewels, fine cloth or perfumed incense—can quite literally kill. Pampa’s description of the kingdom as poisonous is never more palpable than in this passage in which a column of perfumed smoke takes on the character of a venomous snake. Yet, embedded within this lesson about the pursuit of pleasure, the love between Śrimati and Vajrajaṅga persists. They do not let go of each other even in death.

The lovers quickly take human birth as Arya Vajrajaṅga and Arya Śrimati in Bhōgabhumi, literally the land of pleasure. Birth in one of the various Jain Bhōgabhumis is classed as a subcategory of human birth (mānusya-gati), but its experience resembles
the sorrow free world of pleasure found in heaven (dēvalōka). Digambara texts associate birth in this realm as a result of the giving of charity (dāna) to a worthy recipient (pātra).

It is a place where youth does not diminish, great devotion does not decline, glances are returned, and pleasure is filled with loved. Without separation, the united loves relished the enjoyable pastimes with the love of Manmatha. With their hearts fluttering greatly, they roamed and clashed in the various pleasures. How does the land of pleasure give without fail like the world of heaven? In this way, in the land of pleasure, the abode of many pleasures… They were intoxicated by the āgaru incense smoke. There, as if suddenly understanding, that divine couple became a human couple without ever releasing their embrace. Without the sweetness of pleasure perishing, they were encircled by love. Without any decrease, they obtained supreme happiness always. It resembled the greatness of the giving of charity to a worthy recipient.

This passage captures the distinctly Digambara connection between charity (dāna), birth in a Bhōgabhumi, and the experience of heaven-like pleasure. In this place, the couple experiences only pleasure and no ills. Harkening back to their death by asphyxiation that preceded their current birth, we are reminded again that Śrimati and Vajrajaṅgha never released their poignant embrace. As such, the Bhōgabhumi becomes yet another landscape for their erotic love.

461 Ibid., 161. On the same page Williams also notes that the Śvētāmbaras have no such association between birth in a bhōgabhumi and dāna.
462
Such scenes of pleasurable excess in the land of pleasure are interrupted by the arrival of a pair of sky-going Jain munis. Bent in devotion, the couple bathes the munis’ feet with “water mixed with tears of joy” (ānāḍāśrumiśritajala). Remarking on his inability to stop crying, Arya Vajrajaṅgha addresses the munis:

Seeing your lotus-like feet, praiseworthy by the best among the munis, somehow did not stop our tears. What is the reason for that? Why does this intense love come to mind? Relationships from previous lives continue to exist. If we did not have a previous relationship, this love could not occur. I now understand this curiosity because it has happened to me.\(^\text{463}\)

Vajrajaṅgha realizes through his emotional response that he knows the elder monk Pṛitiṅkara from a past life when he was born as King Mahābala and the monk was his minister and Jain adherent Svayaṁbuddha. Here we see that transmigratory love—erotic or otherwise—animates the relationships between all the souls in the Ādipurāṇa. The monk Pṛitiṅkara arrives not just to bring about this realization, but also to help guide Vajrajaṅgha and Śrimati’s souls towards liberation much like the Minister Svayaṁbuddha had previously guided King Mahābala. For Śrimati, liberation entails rebirth as a man. Pṛitiṅkara warns her, “Mother, don’t have even a little doubt. Believe this alone. You are entangled in the sorrow that comes from inhabiting the female form. Make no mistake, you are wasting away.”\(^\text{464}\) He departs with his fellow muni after instructing the lovers in correct sight (samyaṅkarṣaṇa) and correct belief (samyaṅkṛta).

\(^{463}\) munivṛndārakavandya nimma caranāmbhōjaṅgaḷaṃ kaṇḍu kaṅbanigal māṇḍpuvillā kāraṇam adēvaṃ citakkatipṛiti toṭane kaygaṅmuvudēke pürvabhavadoḷ bandhutvam uṇṭakkum in-tinitondilladoḍāgadāytenagidaṃ keḷvondu kautūhalaṃ || PĀP, 5.47 {utpalamāle}

\(^{464}\) Ibid., v. 5.62 {matēbha}.
The couples’ life is thus transformed; desire for pleasure is replaced by a desire for liberation.

Yet, the centrality of pleasure in Ādinātha’s earlier births is only momentarily displaced. After all, meritorious religious activity is rewarded by either a pleasurable human birth (as a king), a pleasurable divine birth (as a god), or liberation. Meritorious acts can result in worldly reward that can serve to distract from a Jain religious orientation; such is the challenge posed by the tradition. For example, Arya Vajrajaṅgha is next reborn as the god Śridhara in the Śripрабha Palace, “an abode of sexual pleasure” (suratasukhanidhāna), in the Īśāna Heaven. Having discarded her degraded female form through the practice of samyaktva, Arya Śrimati is reborn as Svayaṃprabha, an attendant Sāmānika God to the God Śridhara.465 Stripped of its eroticism, but still bound through affection, their relationship is transformed into one of divine companionship or subservience. Even without the erotic connection to Svayaṃprabha’s soul, Ādinātha’s rebirth as Śridhara maintains the hyper-sexualization of his past incarnations. His expansive chest is rubbed by the heavenly ladies’ nipples and his lower lip is violently squeezed by divine prostitutes during the friction of sexual union.466 Yet his soul is aware in a way that it has never been before. With clairvoyant knowledge (avadhibōdha), he comes to know that the monk Prītiṅkara has achieved omniscience (kēvalajñāna). He goes to his former minister and current spiritual guide to ask about the fates of Sambhinna, Śatamata, and Mahāmati, the other three ministers who graced King

---

466 PĀP, v. 5.71 {matēbha}. 
Mahabāla’s court. Prītiṅkara narrates their hellish births born out of their false knowledge (*mithyajñāna*) arising from their commitment to other faiths. Filled with *dharma*, through his divine powers Śridhara visits each former minister undergoing the torment of hell and converts them to the correct path of Jainism. He then falls from heaven and is reborn as Suvidhi to Queen Sundaranande and Sudṛṣṭi, King of Eastern Vidēha.

Chapter six opens with the marriage of Suvidhi to his beloved Manōrame. The god Svayamprabha’s soul—previous incarnated as Śrimati (*Śrimaticara*)—descends from heaven and is born as their beloved son Kēśavāṅka. Lalitāṅga and Svayamprabhe’s souls previously born as Vajrajaṅgha and Śrimati, Arya Vajrajaṅgha and Arya Śrimati, Śridhara and Svayamprabha, and now Suvidhi and Kēśavāṅka are never truly parted. The expression of their love is yet again transformed into a familial love between a father and a son. The tenor of this birth also marks a notable shift in location of Ādinātha’s soul along the moral continuum towards liberation. While Suvidhi devoutly worships the Jina, Abhyaghōṣa, his father-in-law, renounces the world. His thousand wives, five thousand sons, and eighteen thousand famous kings follow his lead and also renounce, but Suvidhi could not. Pampa describes his state,

> Suvidhi became entangled in the expansive love from his previous life towards his son.  
> He discarded that white umbrella, the symbol of his power, and became an excellent householder.  
> There is always love at the lotus-like feet of the Lord Jina.  
> The tight bonds of *karma* loosen very slowly from the gross body.  
> The five lay vows are: to not kill, to not desire another’s wife, to not steal, to not lie, and to reduce and cease having bad desire.  

---

```
suvidhiyum ātmatanūbhava  
bhavavipuḷasēhanigaladindame toḍardā  
dhavalātapavāraṇakaku-  
davibhūtiyan uḷidu negaldu pāsakanādaṃ || 6.6 {kanda}
```
We see here that Suvidhi’s paternal love is laden with former his erotic love for Svayamprabhe and Śrimati and his divine friendship with Svayamprabha. The love that binds souls through multiple lifetimes accrues in each such that paternal love and erotic love are materially connected; the binding love that undergirds them is the same. Not being able to renounce the world writ large because of his transmigratory attachment to Kēśavāṅka, Suvidhi offers up a novel vision of royal renunciation that ends not in the practice of austerities and subsequent liberation, but in paradigmatic Jain householdership. Only at the end of his life is he able to fully renounce. With the loss of his father, Kēśavāṅka too renounces the kingdom. Pampa, however, is empathetic to his main characters/souls’ plight. He notes that the tight bonds of *karma* (*karmabandhada bigipu*), and by this he clearly means love, take time to loosen from the body. Indeed, through the repetitious literary cycles of birth, death, and rebirth, the reader becomes attuned to the long temporality of transmigration and the shifting shape of emotion within it.

Now inhabiting a relationship of companionship, Suvidhi and Kēśavāṅka’s entangled souls are reborn in the Acyuta Heaven as Acyutēndra and Pratīndra respectively. Acyutēndra is ensconced at the center of three divine assembly halls comprised of one hundred and fifty-nine palaces surrounded by a host of variously ranked gods, forty thousand bodyguards, elephants, horses, chariots, dancers, and eight main queens. We have seen the sumptuary familiarity of this world before, but, unlike in padepu jinēndrapādakamaṇgaḷoḷ āvagam āge karmabandhada bigipoyyanoyyane saḍiltare bādara rūpadinde koḷḷada paranārigāṭisada kaḷḷadasatyadoḷ ondadāgaḷuṃ kudidapatṛṣṇeyaṃ kusidu māṇisuvaydum anuvrataṅgaḷaṃ || *PĀP*, 6.7 \{campakamāle\}
his past lives, Acyutēndra’s sexual desire is satiated through mental sexual intercourse
\((\text{manaḥpravīcāra})\) rather than through its physical experience.\(^{468}\) However, it is not just
sex that is internalized, Acyutēndra mentally consumes food only once every twenty-two
thousand years and takes a breath only once every eleven months. With the ceasing of
bodily needs, he is able to focus fully on the Jain Āgamas. So focused on the Jina, he falls
from heaven and is born as Vajranābhi to Queen Śrikānte and King Vajrasēna.

The increasingly ascetic focus on Ādinātha’s soul does not mean that his bond of
affection for his former lover, divine attendant, son, and divine companion is broken.
Initially born as Svayaṃprabhe, Pratīndra is now born as the son Dhanadēva to
Anantamati and Kuberadatta, a head merchant in King Vajrasēna’s realm.\(^{469}\) The bonds
of love repeat themselves in this life yet again:

\[
\text{You see the bondage of infatuations tied like a shackle in a previous life}
\]
\[
\text{suddenly becomes new again.}
\]
\[
\text{It penetrates and obstructs the mind.}
\]
\[
\text{It enters into the joints until it resembles a seam made of cement.}
\]
\[
\text{Out of love from previous births, he experienced extreme love for Vajranābhi.}\(^{470}\)
\]

Dhanadēva’s connection to Vajranābhi maintains the structure of affection established by
the text—the emotion is stable while the relationship that it animates is not. Marking a

\(^{468}\) Ibid., v. 6.14 \{\text{kanda}\}. Mental forms of sexual intercourse \((\text{manaḥpravīcāra})\) stand in
opposition to physical forms of sexual intercourse \((\text{kayapravīcāra})\), a differentiation that
goes back to the Tattvārtha Sūtra. Such cerebral sexual interactions have peculiar
consequences in the harem: “Among the ladies are a group of \text{apsaras} for each queen’s
retinue as well as many queens who were born through strange phenomena” excerpt of
Ibid., v. 6.15 \{\text{kanda}\}. To what strange phenomena \((\text{vikaraṇa})\) does Pampa refer? Despite
the fact that sex is disembodied, children are still curiously born through its mental
imitation.

\(^{469}\) Excerpt from \text{PĀP vacana} v. 6.21.

\(^{470}\) nīgalambol toḍardondu mōhanigalāṃ tajjanmadol nōḍato-
\ttage mattaṃ posatāge tamma mandoḷ talpoydu taṭtatagu-
\[pugalol] pukkuvu vajralēpada tagulpaṃ pōlvinaṃ vajranā-
bhigatiprītiyan uṇṭumāḍidar avar janmāntarasēhadiṃ || \text{PĀP}, 6.22 \{\text{matēbha}\}
new iteration of the enduring love that binds these two souls, Pampa goes on to specify that their relationship is now one friendship (sahāya). This verse intensifies Pampa’s earlier description of the stickiness of love. Now he tells us that the materiality of emotional infatuation (mōhanigaḷa) has the quality of cement (vajralēpa); it solidifies by penetrating crevices and filling cracks. Reflecting the approaching shift in the text towards worldly renunciation that culminates in Ādinātha’s final birth as Ṛṣabha, Pampa also takes on a newly derisive tone, employing a word for infatuation (mōha) that can also mean delusion and comparing such repetitive emotional entanglements to shackles (nigaḷa/nigaḍa). There appears to be a limit to love, at some point liberation has to become the predominate focus of desire.

These souls are reunited in this life until Vajranābhi, satiated by mundane pleasure, is freed from desire. With no need for his kingdom, he renounces.471 His five thousand sons, sixteen thousand fellow kings, fifty thousand beautiful women, eight loving brothers, and Dhanadēva, his friend and companion (nijasahāya), join him on the path of asceticism.472 After achieving great fame through austerities, Vajranābhi is then reborn as an Ahamindra god in the Sarvārthasiddhi Heaven, a specific type of divine birth that precedes liberated human birth.473 Unsurprisingly, following his friend, Dhanadēva takes birth in that same realm.474 In the Sarvārthasiddhi Heaven, Vajranābhi’s Ahamindra’s body nears perfection; we are, after all, growing proximate to this soul’s

471 Ibid., vv. 6.25-vacana v. 6.26 {matēbha}.
472 Ibid., v. 6.27 {piriyakkara}.
473 Ibid., vacana v. 6.34-6.36 {kanda}.
474 Ibid., v. 6.48 {kanda}.
liberation. He again experiences expansive pleasure without physical intercourse

(nihpravīcāra).⁴⁷⁵ And then we get the explicit statement that

During transmigration, foolish people claim that pleasure is female companionship.
If that is so, it is strenuous for the body.
Abiding in semen and menstrual blood has only momentary charm.
Therefore, there is no other pleasure
    other than the pleasure arising from happiness born in him.
Pleasure develops from a thing only to have that very thing disappear.
Does even its disappearance cause an erection?
There is nothing whatsoever equal to the pleasure of the heavenly realms.
But even that itself is less than the pleasure of liberation. Who can describe the
pleasure there?⁴⁷⁶

An interesting doxigraphical logic undergirds this verse. While still derisive and even
satirical in tone, Pampa concedes the point that sex brings momentary pleasure, as his
own poem amply illustrates. Heaven even more so yields unimaginable pleasure.
However, neither sexual nor divine pleasure matches the pleasure of liberation. It is
simply indescribable. By putting these spheres of pleasure—each conceptually linked
through the repetition of the word sukhā—into a doxigraphical relationship (wherein each
succeeding form subsumes the prior), Pampa once again points to a relationship between

---

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid., v. 6.43 {kanda}.
⁴⁷⁶ strīsamsargsaṃ sukham em-bīsamsārigaḷe jaḍar adappoḍe tanugā
   yāsakaraṃ suklārta-vāsitam āpātamātraramāṇīyataraṃ || 6.44 {kanda}
   adaṟindaṃ tannoḷ pu-ṭṭida santasadindam āda sukham adu sukham a-
   lladudaltu vastuvindā-dudu vastuvo kunde kundugum nimirdapudē || 6.45 {kanda}
   ā nākanikāya sukha-
   m ēnuṃ doreyilladarke mōkṣada sukhadin-
   dēnānuṃ kundugum adu
tān ene baṇṇisuvan āvan alliya sukhamanaṃ || PĀP, 6.46 {kanda}
the erotic and the liberatory. Erotic pleasure in not equivalent to liberatory pleasure, but the former is sublated into the later.

Finally, Pampa arrives at Ādinātha’s eleventh and final birth as Ṛṣabha, in which Pampa moves away from grappling with the mundane world to grappling with the other world. The pace of his narrative also changes at this point. Ādinātha’s prior ten incarnations each comprise anywhere from a half a chapter (āśvāsa) to a chapter and a half with the love story between Vajrajaṅgha and Śrimati being the most elaborate. Ṛṣabha’s life is told in an expanded literary temporality in contrast to these earlier births. The entirety of chapter seven is consumed just by Indra’s consecration of the baby Ṛṣabha, a sacred event in the life of a Tīrthaṅkara known as the janmakalyāṇa or snātrapūja. Chapter eight focuses on the life of Ṛṣabha as a king: his youth culminating in royal consecration, his marriage to Yaśasvati and Sunande, and the birth and education of his hundred sons and two daughters. Chapter nine recounts Ṛṣabha’s liberation and the dance of Nīlāñjane previously analyzed as its precipitating factor.

At the end of this chapter, Ādinātha is reunited with his twined soul who in this life is born as Prince Śrēyāṃṣa.

In that way, to the surprise of all the world’s people, the Lord of Munis passed more than five months and then a full year wandering for the sake of collecting alms. With the previous incarnations Svayaṃprabhe, Śrimati, Arya Śrimati, Kēśava, Praṇindra, Dhanadēva, Ahamindra came from the Sarvārthasiddhi Heaven. He became the younger brother called Śrēyāṃsa, an excellent treasure, to Sōmaprabha, the crest-jewel of the Kuru lineage who was ruling Hastināpura, the capital of the Kurujāṅgaṇa kingdom. When the late night turned into daybreak… He explained to his older brother the dream in which he saw Mt. Mēru, covered with a grove of wish-fulfilling trees, approach ‘as if decorations in the royal palace’s courtyard and, shortly after, Ādibrahma arrived resembling a divine mountain that yields desired wealth. Meanwhile, inside the city, the foremost among the Lord of Munis became increasingly desirous of emancipation and indifferent to worldly objects. Meditating on the practice of friendship, joy, compassion, and indifference, he was engrossed in
the natural state of the mundane body: all embodied souls are submerged in sorrow and additional qualities. He became opposed to moving extremely quickly or slowly and was deeply intent in observing the width and length of the earth. Without discriminating between the city and the forest, he wandered among the first, middle, and last dwellings with the monk Candragati. As he turned towards King Sōmaprabha’s palace, he was followed by city folk who became frenzied as his sight. When he approached, the watchman Siddhārtha came running. When his arrival became known to Sōmaprabha and Śrēyāṃsa their placid lotus faces blossomed by speaking to the venerable Tīrthāṅkara.

Those brothers rose up, came out of the palace, and, with their hands, offered to him—the one with faultless qualities—bathing water for his feet. Reaching him, they bowed down with excessive devotion to his lotus like feet. The best of munis shown in between those two

as if the Mandara Mountain in the middle of the Nīla and Niṣadha peaks.

Then, when Śrēyāṃsa saw the naked form of the Dīgambara muni Āditīrthāṅkara, he understood everything from the memory of his previous birth. In his birth as Śrimati, she and Vajrajaṅgha were in the Śaṇpasaroḍāvara lake. According to custom, they gave the charity of food to a pair of munis.

He is a wish-fulfilling tree that arrived to give everything that is desired. He is an eternal treasure that arrived to give merit acquired previously, saying, “Please take.”

He loved him as if approaching all the prosperity of the three world.

Oh! How did he feel happy in the mind?

Śrēyāṃsa possesses earrings that are wise sayings and soaring shoulders.

He is a swan that ornaments the lake that is the mind of good poets.

In that way, his mind was gratified with excessive delight.

On the other side, the auspicious sound of songs and music became excessive.

With auspicious accouterments and substances, the beautiful crowd possessed pleasing clothes.

Ādinātha was caused to stop due to the rising of Śrēyāṃsa’s supreme devotion.

With excellent virtue, that one with the rising essence of saṃsāra stood at the door of the best house like a standing treasure.477

---

477 antā munīśvarāṅge nikhilajagajajānāścharyacaryacaryāparyatanaṇadoś attaṃ mattonđraud̐iṅga| pūge samvatsaraṇaṇa nelandu kurujāṅgaṇaviśayaviśēṣakamappa hastināpuramāṇaīlva kuruvaṃśaśikhāmanegē sōmaprabhāhūge tattvayaṃprabhāśriyāryāśvayampradhāvēvakēśavamahēścacyutapraṇāndhānadēvacar aṃ ahamindraṃ sarvārthasiddhiyīṃ bandu parāmśreyōṇidhānaṃ śrēyāṃsan emboṣ priyāṇuṇaṃ ādirśītīmatandaṃ andina belagappa căvadoḷ—vacana suraśailaṃ kalpavrāṃprakararirvāṃ rājagēhāṅgaḷalān-karaṇoṃ bandiruduṇaṃ kandaṃraaragirinibhanm prārthīrthapadramaṃ māṇićadādibrahman ēltarpudane kanaṇaṃ vēljaptapendąragrajaṅgā-daradinedaṃ pēḷu kāṇbutsavadoḷe paramānandamāṃ tāldinēdaṇaṃ || 9.128 {kanda} annegam ādimunśvaranum purāntarāḷadoḷ samvēgavairāgyābhīvṛdhyartham āgī jagatkāyasvabhāvabhāvanāparaṃ sakkalaśārīrigunāḍhikaduḥkḥarditāvinītaroḷ maitripramōdakāruṇyamādhyaṣhavṛttigalaṃ bhāvisuttuṃ
Prior to this passage, in this incarnation, these two souls have no contact and know nothing about one another. And yet the inevitability of their meeting is unmistakable.

Pampa gives the first full account of the continuum of Śrēyāṃsa’s previous lives (bhavāvalī) as if to remind the reader that this is, indeed, the very same soul who has repeated reunited with Ādinātha’s over many lifetimes. Their current and final reunion is foreshadowed by Śrēyāṃsa’s dream, a dream that quickly comes true. However, the quality and tenor of this reunion has a dramatically different tone than their prior interactions. Śrēyāṃsa immediately bows to Ādinātha with “extreme devotion” (atibhakti) and Ādinātha pauses in his wandering because of Srēyāṃsa’s “supreme

---

*yugapramāṇaṃkṣōṇinirīkṣaṇamitratanumati drutavilambhitagativyapētānum āgi
nagarāraṇyananirviśeṣanumadhyamahajaghangyāgarāṅgalo candragatīryin saluttum
ālokanasambhamōpētāpurajānānugamyamānanāṃ sōmaprabharājamanidirābhimukhan āgi
barpannegarē dvārapālaṃ siddhārthakėmāṃ embaṃ parianda
bhagavavṛttakapsaktavacanaracanāprasamnamukhasarasiruha āgirda
sōmaprabhaṅgāṃ śrēyāṃsaṅgāṃ arjipidalā —
karakatārgyapāday nāravadyaguṇāṅge samastarājadakaṃ
berasidir ēldu rājagṛhdhiṃ poramaṭṭatibhaktyin padām-
buruhaman eyde vandega śōbhisidāṃ munimukhayā āgal
irvāra nāduvirdo nilanisādhāṅgāla madhyada mundārēdriyol || 9.129
āgal āditīrthakartārāna digambararūpamaṃ kāṇaloḍaṃ śrīmatiyāda bhavadoḷ
vajraṅghanum tanum ērdū sāsparēvaradoḷ cāranayugalakke vidhipūrvakāṇ
āhāradānnamāṃ koṭṭudan āgal āgalē puṭṭida bhavasamkāradindanā savistaram āridu —
vacanā
īyāl bandattu kalpānghirāṃ abhimatamaṃ pūrvapunyārjitaṃ ko-
īyāl bandattidondakṣayanidhiyenunā matann ērdū trilōka-
śrīyellāṃ pordidalēnosedanā manadoḷ sūktikārṇapāyataśnāṃ
śrēyāṃsaṃ prōnnatāṃsaṃ sukavijanamanomānasōttāṃsahamsaṃ || 9.130
{mahāṣragdhare}
antatipramōdaprīṇitāntākaraṇān āgi—vacanā
idiroḷ maṅgālātātūryaninādaṃ kayganmo māṅgalyāvē-
șada kāntatā maṅgalōpakaraṇadravyangalēndoppe pē-
rcida tanuttambahaktiyin nirjīsudum śrēyōghrāvārdad
nidhinivandite nindan ērjhitaṅganāṃ samsārasārodayaṃ || PĀP, 9.131 \{campakamāle\}.
devotion” (uttamabhakti). Much like the word vow (nōntu) flagged above, devotion (bhakti) too is a term loaded with significance that Pampa uses only in a religious context. While difficult to distill down to a single definition, bhakti names a pan-Indic orientation of love towards a divine or spiritually perfected object that inspires a range of emotionally laden activities including ritual worship, meditation, the composition of poetry, songs of praise and many more. Bhakti is typically translated into English as devotion, however, the word can also simply mean love, albeit a religiously inflected form of love. The point is that these two souls are always in love, but this love takes on very different forms of expression between lovers, companions, friends, family members, and finally between a monk and lay devotee. The stability of love in variation again suggests some connection between its different forms of expression from śṛṅgāra to bhakti. To this point, it is unsurprising that upon seeing Ādinātha in all of his monastic glory, Śrēyāṃsa specifically remembers their former births as Śrimati and Vajrajaṅgha, the culmination of their transmigratory love affair.

The bond of love between Ādinātha and Śrēyāṃsa gives the later access to privileged knowledge of the monk that has meritorious effects.

The first Tīrthaṅkara became perfected by the seven virtues including faith along with the meritorious nine treasures including the acceptance of gifts, etc… In the beginning of Karma Bhumi, Śrēyāṃsa, the founder of the first charity to the Tīrthaṅkara, along with his elder brother Sōmaprabha, caused the first Tīrthaṅkara to stand still. With the vessel of his wide hands raised above, he poured until he caused a beautiful flood of white sugar cane juice equal to divine nectar as if a flood of merit that filled a golden water-pot. The stream of gold appeared impossible especially to the eyes. Fallen from the hands of the gods, a flood of fresh flowers flowed everywhere. While, at that time, the forcefully blowing wind grew mild. The incessant flood of jewels and flowers appeared like the rows of various fruits and freshly blossomed flowers of the trees given as charity to worthy recipients.

\[478\] Ibid., v. 9.129 \{kanda\} \& v. 9.131 \{campakamāle\}.
The beautiful divine sounds, “Oh! A charitable person!
Oh! A worthy recipient! Oh! The act of charity! Oh! A gift!,”
resounded in the sky along with the joyful sound of drums.
In this way, the founder of the first charity to the Tīrthaṅkara satisfied Ādinātha’s bodily needs.
After that, Śrēyāṃsa and Sōmaprabha…… said,
“Today the Kuru lineage is purified on the earth.
Today, our house has become sacred on the earth. It is powerful.
When you came near, you showed us favor. Today our desires have become fulfilled.
Then, both of them with extreme devotion they bowed to his lotus feet.
In that way while they bowed…
The supreme muni blessed them saying,
“May you experience endless charity without interruption.”
Afterward, on the auspicious day of ākṣaya tritiya,
did he not become famous in the entire world due to merit?
In that way, the lord of the yatis blessed them and started off. The two kings were not able to separate from him so they went all together.
In this way, they accompanied the Muni Ṛṣabha a short distance up until the entrance of the forest. Again and again, without blinking, they stared at him.
Sōmapraha and Śrēyāṃsa return having somehow managed to part from him. With great fanfare, they gave pearls and jewels from the hands of the gods to all the townspeople. Lord Bharata experienced wonder at his famous preeminent charity. He asked, “From which sign did that great soul Śrēyāṃsa apprehend Ādibhaṭṭāraka’s state of mind, which is a deep receptacle like a great ocean?” Together the group of kings, Akampana and so on, came to perform worship.
“Your charity appears to have astonished both the divine and human realms. Oh! Great man! In what manner were you able to distinguish the guru’s state of mind?
With renounced passion, today you, the flag of the Kuru lineage, became an object of great veneration to me and my lord.” Because of this greatness, he questioned him. Śrēyāṃsa replied in this way, “Vajrabāhu, his eighth birth from this one, was ruling the city Utpalakhēta in the Puṣkaḷāvatī Country of Easter Vidēha of this Jambūdvīpa. His Queen Vasundhare had a son called Vajrajaṅgha. In the city of Puṇḍarīkiṇi of that country, I became the daughter called Śrimati to Cakravarti Vajradanta and his chief Queen Lakṣmīmati. At that time, I was Vajrajaṅgha’s beloved. Living on the shore of the Śaṣpasarōvara Lake, he gave food to a pair of munis according to the precepts.
Just now, while seeing Ādinātha’s muni form, I became aware of my previous births. Understanding the state of the correct path, I established the act of giving charity to him. And it is through the giving of food and so on that one becomes the benefactor to the best ones who are the proper recipients of charity.”

479

embinaṃ āditirhatkātāranam śraddhaādisaptaguṇasampannamaṃ
pratigrahādīnāvidhupunyapurassaranum āgī niṣī karmabhāmiyamōdalōḷ ādi
dānādit hapravartakaṃ śrēyāṃsaṃ nibhrajān appa sōmaprabhaṃ berasu kanakakaḷaśadōḷ
tīvida amṛtarasasamānadahavaliṣkurasadhāre punyadhāreyante sōgayisuvinam
samuttānīkṛtaviśālapāṇipātradoḷ ēṛevudum—vacana
In this dramatic scene, Śrēyāṃsa immediately knows—due to the deep emotional resonances of affection built up over time—to offer sugar cane juice to the fasting Ādinātha. After this act of charity, he is forever celebrated and imitated as the dānatīrthakara or the giver of charity to the Tīrthaṅkara. Bharata, Ādinātha’s eldest son, is astonished that a seeming stranger could have anticipated and so fulfilled the bodily needs of his father. In vacana v. 10.7, Bharata probes Śrēyāmsa on the matter. Pampa repeats Bharata’s question in the following verse—a literary strategy that he uses to emphasize particular content through both prose and meter. Śrēyāṃsa replies by referring back to their former incarnation as Śrimati and Vajrajaṅgha. His general awareness of his past lives gives him access to correct knowledge in the present and, because of his persistent devotional love for Ādinātha, he performs a meritorious act of charity.

Throughout the Ādipurāṇa narrative, Śrēyāṃsa’s soul moves in tandem with Ādinātha’s through the cycle of transmigration. As Ādinātha’s soul progress along the moral continuum to liberation, so too does Śrēyāṃsa’s soul progress, most notably thematized when he sheds his female form and is born a man, thereby embodied with liberatory potential. In Ādinātha’s final birth, Śrēyāṃsa is singled out to perform the Tīrthaṅkara’s fast-breaking, perhaps the most significant act that can occur between a lay Jain and a monk. Precipitated through their transmigratory bond of love, this foundational act further serves to orient Śrēyāṃsa’s soul on the path of liberation. If enduring love morally progresses Śrēyāṃsa, then it also has no detrimental effect on Ādinātha. Even in

---

480 Appleton notes, “It would appear that serving the Buddha has some sort of karmic potency, perhaps linked to the positive mental state brought about by proximity to such an advanced being.” Naomi Appleton, Narrating Karma and Rebirth: Buddhist and Jain Multi-life Stories (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 31. The case of Śrēyāṃsa’s service to the first Tīrthaṅkara suggests that the same is true for Jainism as well.
his last incarnation he maintains their bond developed over lifetimes. This poetic and affective exploration looks extraordinarily un-Jain, if we understand Jainism as a religion characterized by a profoundly otherworldly orientation, an austere ascetic focus, and a goal of severing emotional and worldly bonds. Yet, in this chapter, I suggest that if we let ourselves rethink Jainism through Pampa's narrative, we are confronted with a soteriological proposition that binding to the world, as one binds to a lover, ultimately produces a liberatory unbinding from it.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, the central souls in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ may be caught up in romance, but this chapter proposes that that is not always such a bad thing. Through poetic elaboration of a courtly aesthetic in both form and content, Pampa establishes a very clear place for erotic love and emotional attachment within the Jain tradition. While deeply indebted to Jinasēna’s earlier version of the text and Sanskrit kāvya more broadly, Pampa makes the Ādipurāṇa his own through a focus on the aesthetic possibilities of erotic love, enduring affective bonds, human intimacy, and sumptuary excess. While Pampa names erotic love directly as śṛṅgāra rasa, he also subtly develops the sentiment throughout his poetry by invoking standardized erotic narratemes, characters, and landscapes draw from Sanskrit literature. In this way, he incorporates and transforms a distinctly Sanskrit literary sensibility into the emergent genre of Kannada campū kāvya.

Pampa’s poetry relies on a discrete Jain ontology in which emotions adhere not just in a single lifetime, but also throughout the protracted experience of transmigration. Within a Jain literary framework, the very temporality of love is inherently transmigratory. What does transmigratory love do within the text? Through its different
iterations that are relationally defined, a poetics of transmigratory love makes a connection between all expressions of love as ultimately deriving from the same emotion. Erotic love between a husband and wife, paternal love that a father bears for his son, and the devotional love between a Jain layperson and monk are all interrelated and accumulate over time. Through various readings in this chapter, I suggest that Pampa did not view these emotional entanglements as problematic or spiritually inhibitory; rather love itself holds liberatory potential when properly situated within Jainism.

If for Jains emotion has a materiality and temporal causality like karma, its relationship to karma is somewhat underspecified. Indeed, often when Pampa speaks about the effects of love he does so through the vocabulary of karma. If we consider Pampa’s Kannada poetry alongside the Deccani Digambara Jain secondary cannon—produced after the loss of the fourteen Pūrva scriptures—there is a clear connection. The secondary cannon of the Saṭkhaṇḍāgama and the Kṣayaprabhṛta is entirely focused on unpacking the minute workings of karma. In contrast, Pampa poetically elaborates the subtle workings of emotions. Pampa’s poetic sensibility brings to the Ādipurāṇa a further attunement to the ways in which emotion is also constituent of human causality. Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam suggests that there is a beautiful emotional intensity in the bleakness of rebirth.

Why does love become a point of poetic elaboration for Pampa? To begin with, the Ādipurāṇam is a text about kings and their courts. As I have previously argued, kingship offers up a heightened experience of the world through which a soul must journey to reach liberation. Kingship too—much like love and sexual pleasure—is the reward for meritorious past deeds. And finally, kings are the established heroes of
premodern South Asian literature. In thinking of the Ādipurāṇam as a poem about kingship it becomes impossible to disregard erotic love and romance. Perhaps more than any other guise, kings are romantic heroes par excellence. Such a text about kings inherently becomes a text about love in some form or another. The range of textual examples explored above from Nīlāñjane’s dance to Svayamprabhe and Lalitāṅga’s sex on an artificially constructed hill demonstrates the ways in which Pampa wallows in courtly life as a structuring feature of both heaven and earth. The conclusion I draw is that Pampa, on the one hand, sought to find place for romance within Jainism and, on the other, sought to propose both Jainism and erotic love as constitutive features of a cultivated courtly self. Through these various aesthetic accommodations, Pampa resists an opposition between erotic love, the courtly or cultivated self, and the religious.

A focus on worldliness and the proposition that a soul must go through the world to reach liberation is not unique to Pampa—we see this in Jinasēna as well. What this chapter highlights as distinctive about Pampa’s poetry is his particular sensitivity to emotion as a constitutive feature of human existence. The affective ties that bind souls together are not simply aesthetic opportunities for the production of beautiful poetry—although they are that as well—but rather are compelling in that they capture the very real difficulty of letting go of the ones we love, the joy of reunion, the pleasure of sex, and so on. As a Jain lay poet freed from religious didacticism, Pampa infused his poetry with richly human experience that harmonized Jainism and courtly culture.
CHAPTER 5

Acts of Translation: The Ādipuraṇa in Text, Image, and Inscription

1. Introduction

Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam leaves us with the image of an erotically entangled king transformed into a devotionally entangled Tīrthaṅkara. In this text, love is not something to get out of, but rather a disposition that takes on various iterations—as husband and wife, father and son, and friends—that culminates in religious devotion. Through the optic of kingship and the court, Pampa provides the ontological and emotional scaffolding that makes a robust culture of Jain devotion thinkable. In this chapter, I begin to think through ideological change across time, tracking how the image of an ideal Jain king transforms from a renunciate and an erotic subjectivity to a devotional one. In the process, I argue, Jain poets began articulating a theory of self-sovereignty divorced from the mundane forms of kingship that had previously penetrated and shaped their ideological worlds. The proper object of devotion is a self-sovereign. Although this is the final chapter of my dissertation, it in many ways serves as an opening, an opening up of Jainism in the late tenth century, when Jains began to look beyond the hermetic horizons of the court and transformed their aesthetic register to align with a different and far more expansive audience. This new aesthetic orientated away from the court entailed changes within the literary object itself, even as Jains began to adopt novel visual and material forms of artistic expression. It is at this moment that we find, for the first time in this region, the emergence of prose poetry in a Dravidian linguistic register (at a moment when highly Sanskritized poetry in mixed prose and verse was in vogue) as well
monumental statuary and long-form poetic inscription, which draws its content from Jain textual traditions such as the Ādipurāṇa. I contend that these aesthetic changes—routed through the figure of Cāvuṇḍarāya and the character of the self-sovereign Bāhubali—that developed at this moment across artistic mediums are related phenomena; the texts, images, and inscriptions that comprise this archive work together to construct a distinctly Jain landscape defined by an emergent devotional culture to Bāhubali that celebrates spiritual sovereignty over and above mundane sovereignty. This particular archive of materials is distinctive: Jain literati maintained a foothold in the courts of the western Deccan through the eleventh and into the twelfth century and continued to write in its elite genres and styles. However, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s improvisations with the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa—translated as they were across text, image, and inscription—inspired further artistic acts that localized Jainism as a feature of the western Deccani landscape.

This moment is neatly captured in the figure of the Western Gaṅga general Cāvuṇḍarāya, also known by the names Gommaṭa and Aṇṇa, who served under Gaṅga King Marasiṃha Satyavākya II (963-975 C.E.) and his successor Rācamalla Satyavākya II (975-986 C.E.). In 978 C.E., Cāvuṇḍarāya composed the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣapurāṇam

---

481 This is not to imply that Jain inscriptions prior to the late tenth century were not poetic. Indeed, Jain inscriptions, most notably at Sravaṇa Belgola, were sites of poetic experimentation that combined prose with mārga and dēsi meters in a style that seem to foreshadow the later rise of campū kāvya as a courtly genre. See for example the metrical variation including Sanskrit vṛttas, prose vacanas, kandas and dēsi meters such as akkara found in EC Vol. 2, nos. 45, 53, 56, 57, and 59.

482 The tenth-century Jain Ganga military general Cāvuṇḍarāya is often confused with the eleventh-century Brahmin writer Cāvuṇḍarāya who wrote an agricultural treatise entitled the Lōkōpakāra (1025 C.E.). The later Cāvuṇḍarāya was patronized by Western Cālukya king Jayasimha II (1015-1042 C.E.) and also held the position of superintendent (sarvādhikāri) within the court. Whitney Cox tracks this Cāvuṇḍarāya or Cāmuṇḍarāya across several inscription in his article “Scribe and Script in the Cālukya West Deccan,” The Indian Economic and Social History Review 47.1 (2010): 1-28. However, it is not
(henceforth called the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇa*), in which the most substantial section is the *Ādipurāṇa* narrative. Cāvuṇḍarāya radically condenses the narrative to a short prose form in a Dravidian linguistic register devoid of the courtly literary pretensions that define Jinasēna and Pampa's earlier Sanskrit and Kannada *kāvya* versions. Three years later, in 981 c.e., Cāvuṇḍarāya consecrated a fifty-seven-foot monolith of Bāhubali, a son of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha detailed in the *Ādipurāṇa* narrative, at the Jain

clear that Cox ever made the connection that this Cāvuṇḍarāya was likely the author of the *Lōkōpakāra*. To differentiate between these two figures they are called Cāvuṇḍarāya I and Cāvuṇḍarāya II respectively. A.V. Narasimha Murthy, “Some Aspects of Agriculture as Described in the *Lōkōpakāra,*” in *History of Agriculture in India up to c. 1200 a.d.*, ed. Lallanji Gopa and V.C. Srivastava (New Delhi: Jointly published by Professor Bhuvan Chandel and Concept Publishing, 2008), 509, fn. 2. In this dissertation I refer to Cāvuṇḍarāya I simply as Cāvuṇḍarāya unless otherwise noted. A third Cāvuṇḍrāya, author of the Sanskrit *Cāritrasāra* (c. 1000 C.E.), a Digambara *śrāvakācāra* text, has also recently come to my attention. Like Cāvuṇḍarāya I, he too also appears to have been a Jain military general who lived in close temporal proximity to Jinasēna from whose *Ādipurāṇa* he quotes. R. Williams, *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Mediavel Śrāvakācāras* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 22-23. Both the name Cāvuṇḍarāya and the name Gommaṭa have been a source of curiosity in the study of this period. Cāvuṇḍarāya is alternatively rendered as Cămūṇḍarāya both in inscriptions from the medieval period as well as in more recent scholarship. The slippage in Kannada between “ma” and “va” is very old, going back to perhaps the sixth century. Orthographically and paleographically this makes sense given that the Kannada letters for “ma” and “va” are frustratingly similar and are easily confused. Moreover, starting with the eleventh-century Kannada grammarian Nāgavarmma, we find the rule that any labial syllable will change to “va” after a vowel or “ya,” “ra,” or “la.” A.N. Narasimhia, *A Grammar of the Oldest Kanarese Inscriptions* (Mysore: University of Mysore, 1941), 59-60 via Caleb Simmons, “The Goddess and the King: Cămūṇḍēsvari and the Fashioning of the Woḍeyar Court of Mysore.” (PhD diss., University of Florida, 2014), 33, fn. 43. Therefore, it is likely that Cămūṇḍēsvaṇa is actually the older or more accurate form of his name. Here I use Cāvuṇḍarāya throughout, following the spelling in the edition of the text used in this dissertation. See Kamala Hamapana & K.R. Sesagiri (eds), *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇa* (Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parisattu, 1983). All references in this chapter refer back to this edition. With regard to the name Gommaṭa, there has been much debate as to the origin of this word. I find A.N. Upadhye’s theory that Gommaṭa, meaning excellent, was a nickname of Kannada origins for Cāvuṇḍarāya to be the most persuasive. A.N. Upadhye, “Gommaṭa,” in *Upadhye Papers* (Mysore: University of Mysore Prasaranga, 1983), 221.
pilgrimage site of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. Following the historical chronology of their production, this chapter reads Cāvuṇḍarāya’s writing of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam and his commissioning of the Bāhubali statue as inextricably bound artistic and devotional acts. The narrative of the Ādipurāṇa elaborated in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam primes the iconologic reading of the statue as an interpretation of the Ādi narrative. The remainder of the chapter explores the interconnected inscriptive and literary ecologies that grew out of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text and image including the long-form inscriptive poem of Boppaṇa at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa (1180 C.E.), a series of Bāhubali monoliths constructed across the western Deccan in the succeeding centuries that replicate the original at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, and the rise of a set of texts that combine the narratives of Bāhubali, Cāvuṇḍarāya, and the monoliths themselves. These materials demonstrate the ways in which the Ādipurāṇa endures as a compelling site of narrative improvisation with the themes of kingship, renunciation, sovereignty, and, ultimately, self-sovereignty.

2. Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Text

If, as I argued in the previous chapter, Pampa's Ādipurāṇam was the culmination

---

483 For the culture of pilgrimage around sallēkhanā, the Jain ritual of fasting to death, that predates the erection of the Bāhubali statue see S. Settar, Inviting Death: Indian Attitude Towards the Ritual Death (Leiden: Brill, 1989) and Pursuing Death: Philosophy and Practice of Voluntary Termination of Life (Dharwad: Karnataka University, 1990). Within the epigraphical record, the broader site of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa is referred to as Dhavaḷasarōvara (EC Vol. 2, no. 108), Dhavaḷasarasa (Ibid., no. 54), Śvētasarōvara (ibid.), Suranagara/surapura (Ibid., no. 105), and Gommaṭapura (Ibid., no. 137). The two hills that comprise this site further bear their own names and titles as described later in this chapter.

484 T.V. Venkatachala Sastry has usefully gathered together a large selection of this Kannada poetry about Bāhubali into a single Kannada volume entitled Kannada Kavigaḷu Kaṇḍa Gommaṭēśvara (Karkala: Bhagavan Sri Bāhubali Mahamastabhisheka Samiti, 1990), which Venugopala Soraba then translated into English as An Anthology of Kannada Poems on Gommateshwara, ed. T.V. Venkatachala Sastry (Shravanabelgola: Gommateshwar Bhagavan Bahubali Mahamastakabisheka Samiti, 1993).
of Jain investment in a courtly aesthetic form, then Cāvuṇḍarāya’s rendition of the same narrative shows us how those investments continued to change and expand. To begin, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s composition of the entire cycle of the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition (triṣaṣṭiṣalākāpuruṣa) takes up less length than the entirety of Pampa’s single story of one man, Ādinātha. Length is not the only point of divergence. Formally, Pampa’s campū more readily mixes verse and prose; in Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text, prose predominates. Indeed, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam is commonly cited as the first piece of prose writing in the history of Kannada literature.\(^{485}\) Other than Śivakōti’s Vaḍḍārādhane—a contemporaneous Kannada commentary and prose summary of a Jain Prakrit ārādhane text—the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam stands out as the sole piece of Kannada narrative prose within the larger body of early medieval Kannada literature entirely comprised of campū kāvyas.\(^{486}\) So here we have a military general, deeply embedded within the Gaṅga court and a literary patron in his own right, choosing to write not in the campū kāvya style that predominated within medieval Deccani courts, but in prose. The stakes of this generic choice are far-reaching; I read Cāvuṇḍarāya’s use of prose rather than campū as evidence of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s intention to write a different kind of text perhaps even for a different kind of audience. To be sure, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam remains influenced by campū: hundreds of verses in both Sanskrit and Kannada


testify to the continued formal predominance of versified poetry. However, the concentration of verses in comparison to prose passages in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇa pales in comparison to the typical ratio found in traditional Old Kannada campūs.

Cāvuṇḍarāya opens his text with a set of twenty Kannada verses; the first two maṅgala verses are dedicated to Ādinātha, Mahāvīra, and the twenty-four Jinas. The remaining eighteen verses of the preface locate Cāvuṇḍarāya within a discreet set of intellectual, literary, and spiritual lineages. First Cāvuṇḍarāya praises the pan-Jain luminaries who came before him including Umāsvāti, Siddasēna, Samantabhadra, and Pūjyapāda. He then turns his focus to the specific Deccani Jain literary world from which he emerged. He celebrates the Sanskrit poets Kaviparamēśvara, Jinasēna, Vīrasēna, Guṇabhadra and the Kannada poets Dharmasēna, Kumarāsēna, Nāgarasēna, Vīrasēna II, Candrasēna, and Āryanandi. The mix of Sanskrit and Kannada poets invoked in these verses weaves together two distinct language trajectories in medieval Deccani Jain writing, suggesting that Cāvuṇḍarāya saw writing in Sanskrit and Kannada as occurring along the same literary continuum—as further evidenced by the Sanskrit verses inserted into his Kannada prose. He then closes with verses that eulogize his spiritual guru Ajitasēna, who was also the guru of Gaṅga King Marasiṃha II as well as the famed Kannada poet Ranna and Attimabbe, the most prominent female Jain donor and devotee of the period. For now. I will focus on the specific literary ecology from which

487 Even Sanskrit prose texts commonly commence with a set of prefatory verses. However, in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ verses are interspersed throughout the entirety of the text. See, for example, the Sanskrit verses in vasantatilaka and upēndravrāja meters on CP, 33

488 Ibid., vv. 1.3-1.7. The authors and their works that Cāvuṇḍarāya cites highlight the importance of the Tattvārthasūtra and its commentaries as a central Jain text for the medieval Digambara Jain community beyond the standard Digambara canon of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama and Kaṣāyaprābhṛta as well as their Dhavālā commentaries.
Cāvuṇḍarāya emerged and its impact on his textual practice.

Cāvuṇḍarāya situates his own mahāpurāṇam by stressing the importance of Kaviparamēśvara:

Did Kaviparamēśvara write just one purāṇam among the tales of great deeds?
[No!] He compiled and wrote the entire Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurusapurāṇam.
In that way, does anyone else exist who has striven for such fame?489

Among his list of previous poets, Cāvuṇḍarāya singles out Kaviparamēśvara alone as the author of a mahāpurāṇa. Jinasēna similarly gestures to this longer literary past with a line in his Ādipurāṇa: "Paramēśvara, who compiled the entire purāṇa called the Vāgarthasamgraha, is worthy of worship by all the poets in the world."490 The phrase "the entire purāṇa" is ambiguous. Following the line of questioning in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam, does Jinasēna mean Kaviparamēśvara wrote a single purāṇa—such as the Ādipurāṇa—or a Mahāpurāṇa? Jinasēna's pupil Guṇabhadra clarifies his preceptor's statement by noting that Paramēśvara—also known as Kaviparamēṣṭhi—wrote the biography of the first Jina (namely, an Ādipurāṇa) in prose (gada).491 And Pampa too

---

489 caritapurāṇadoḷ ondene baredarbaradirkda triṣaṣṭiśalākā- puruṣara purāṇamaṃ kavi- paramēśvararantu jagake nōmtarum oḷare || CP, 8
490 JĀP, v. 1.60.
491 Guṇabhadra says, “The deeds of Puru is a story told in the form of prose by Kaviparamēśvara. This composition possesses words with hidden and very subtle meanings. It contains examples of all meters and poetic ornaments.”
kaviparamēśvaranigaditagadyakathāmātrakaṃ purōścaritam | sakalechandōlaṅkṛtilaksyaṃ sūkṣmārthagūḍhapadaracanaṃ || GUP. 17.
praises Kaviparamēśvara along with Punnata Jinasēna and Pūjyapāda. Therefore, all the poets who participate in what I am calling the Ādipurāṇa tradition cite Kaviparamēśvara as a central figure within the practice of writing either the Mahāpurāṇa or the Ādipurāṇa. Although his text is no longer extant, I bring up Kaviparamēśvara here because the many Sanskrit verses found dispersed throughout the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam are typically ascribed to Kaviparamēśvara rather than to Cāvuṇḍarāya (Although if we are to believe Guṇabhadra, Kaviparamēśvara’s text was composed in prose). Of course, it is impossible to know the origin of these verses since Cāvuṇḍarāya does not tell us; moreover, it is certainly not difficult to imagine a Kannada author writing in Sanskrit given the previously noted prevalence of bilingualism (or even polylingualism) during this period. However, a close reading of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam suggests that the incorporation of another poets' work—such as Kaviparamēśvara’s—was central to Cāvuṇḍarāya's larger literary strategies.

There is a notable omission in Cāvuṇḍarāya's list of literary influences: namely, Pampa, the Kannada ādikavi and author of the first Kannada rendition of the Ādipurāṇam. Pampa's absence is particularly glaring given that it is unambiguous that

---

492 PĀP, v. 1.11 \(\{\text{kanda}\}\).
494 For example, Pampa composes several verses in Sanskrit in his *Vikramārjunavijayaṃ* including verses 14.27-30. Moreover, as noted previously, several Jain authors in the ninth and tenth centuries, most notably Ponna, bore the title “an imperial poet of both [languages]” (ubhayakavicakravarti) indicating their skill in both Sanskrit and Kannada. Lingarāja Urs, the nineteenth-century court poet of Kṛṣṇa Dēvarāja III, was given the title “master over poetry in both [languages]” (ubhayakavivisarada), a title which captures the longer cultural investments in bilingualism and even polylingualism. M.B. Vedavalli, *Mysore as a Seat of Music* (Trivandrum: CBH Publications, 1992), 47 and Gopal, R. *Krishnaraja Wodeyar III: A Historical Study* (Mysore: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, 2010), 86.
Cāvuṇḍarāya follows Pampa's *campū* Kannada version of the Ādi narrative rather than Jinasēna's far more expansive Sanskrit *kāvya* rendition. Cāvuṇḍarāya's omission of a central literary influence is not altogether surprising for this period; it was fairly common practice to omit and obscure the source of one’s borrowing or inspiration. Moreover, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s indebtedness to Pampa is and would have been readily apparent even without attribution. Educated readers from the period would certainly have recognized the deep intertextuality that the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* shares with Pampa’s *Ādipurāṇaṃ*. I identify two central literary strategies that characterize Cāvuṇḍarāya's approach to writing the *Ādipurāṇa* narrative. First, he composes what I describe as summary rewriting. This method captures the essence and central points of Pampa's text, but in a greatly reduced form. Second, he directly adopts passages from the prose sections of Pampa's *Ādipurāṇam* without attribution or perhaps without the need for attribution, a practice that today would be described as plagiarism, but in the tenth-century Deccan was not an altogether uncommon practice of incorporating another poet’s work within one’s own composition.

In the context of the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ*, Cāvuṇḍarāya is only interested in enfolding the prose passages of Pampa's *campū* within his own. Therefore, in his *purāṇa*, some of the content (or, at times, even the entire content) of Pampa's verses is simply left out leading to a highly condensed and, at times, convoluted narrative. To illustrate these two strategies I have selected verse 2.15 from Pampa's *Ādipurāṇam*, which is followed by a prose passage that appears below on the left.\[495\] For comparison's sake, Cāvuṇḍarāya's

\[495\] The use of the term *vacana* (saying) to name the prose passages within *campū kāvya* is a potential site of confusion. Within *campū*, *vacana* names a purely prose style that does not bear any trace of meter as one might find in Sanskrit prose. However, the term
rendering of the exact same passages appears on the right. These passages are drawn from Ādinātha's second birth as King Mahābala and deal with the overarching narrative’s persistent theme of kingship and renunciation. Within his court, Mahābala has a Jain minister named Svayāṃbuddha who is tasked with guiding Mahābala's soul towards renunciation. In this section Svamyaṃbuddha—in competition with ministers from other faiths—tries to persuade the king that "the position of the Lord of the earth, the lord of the gods, and the pleasures of the kingdom are temporary fruits and nothing else." To illustrate the greatness of Jain practice, he narrates the parable of King Daṇḍaka "who punishes enemy feudatories with a daṇḍita stick," but who was also punished for his worldly greed.

vacana does come to name a later style of Kannada free verse, popularized by the poetry of the tenth-century Vīraśaiva community. A.K. Ramanujan, Speaking of Śiva (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 11.

496 PĀP, v. 2.7 {matēbha}—"ānuṣaṅgikaphalāṁ bhūpēndra dēvēndra rājyavilāsāṁ perātu altu."

497 PĀP, v. 2.14 vacana—“daṇḍitārātimanḍalam daṇḍakan.” Traditionally, the vacanas in Old Kannada cămpu are referenced by the preceding verse number. As in the previous chapter, I follow this convention throughout.
He destroyed the earth and looted the deserving.
After burying the seized wealth, he stared at it unblinkingly.
Due to his vast and covetous desire, he said, “It is a waste to even eat.”
He died because of dwindled strength.
Overcoming his greed, King Daṇḍika was born a snake, fangs filled with poison.
He slithered around in his previously hidden treasury.

Due to his corrupt meditation, he was reborn a snake. At the sight of his collected wealth and his son Maṇimāla, he recalled his previous births. While protecting the treasury, he did not let anyone who was present approach except his son. One day, Maṇimāla saw a clairvoyant sage named Raticaraṇa and asked him to tell the story of the snake. He came to know that his father has become a terrible snake” and went to his side.

Daṇḍaka was king for some time. While ruling, he increased his wealth and hid it in the ground. He died extremely greedy. In his treasury....

....he was reborn a snake. At the sight of his wealth and his son Maṇimāla, he recalled his previous births. While protecting the treasury, he did not let anyone who was present approach except his son. One day, Maṇimāla asked a clairvoyant named Raticaraṇa to tell the story of the snake. He came to know about his father and went to his side.
Here we can see Cāvuṇḍarāya's strategy of summary rewriting. The central points of Pampa's verse—namely, that King Daṇḍaka accumulated great wealth that he then hid, died a miserly death, and was reborn as a snake in his former treasury—are densely conveyed in Cāvuṇḍarāya's succinct prose. Left out by Cāvuṇḍarāya are Pampa’s more elaborate details that Daṇḍaka is so greedy that he even considers eating to be a waste of resources and, therefore, starves to death. Next we see Cāvuṇḍarāya's other strategy of directly adopting Pampa's prose demonstrated above by Pampa’s vacana and Cāvuṇḍarāya's parallel prose. With the exception of a few words and the final part of the line, Cāvuṇḍarāya appropriates the entirety of Pampa's prose, which is marked in bold. Cāvuṇḍarāya captures the most accessible and easily readable section of Pampa’s campū (namely, the prose vacana) and transposes it into his own concentrated prose framework that is itself a summary distillation of Pampa’s larger text. In translating, transposing, and rewriting Pampa through these strategies, Cāvuṇḍarāya's text is just as much a record of reading as it is a record of writing; we see moments where he closely reads Pampa by directly adopting his words and other moments when he skims Pampa and summarizes him instead.

Significantly, the last line of Cāvuṇḍarāya's text shifts from Pampa's Sanskritic idiom to a more Dravidian idiom (which is underlined in the above quote). Pampa uses the Sanskrit karmadhārya compounds ātmīyajanakan (my father) and tatsamīpake (to his vicinity), whereas Cāvuṇḍarāya, retaining similar case relationships, glosses these with the exact uncompounded Kannada equivalents tamma ayyan (his father) and adara kelakke (to his side). More broadly speaking, Cāvuṇḍarāya does not adopt the long
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Sanskritic compounds that characterize Pampa's writing. In this same vernacular mode, Cāvuṇḍarāya often employs Kannada verbal forms that are best described as pre-Old Kannada (pūrvahaḷagannaḍa), or the language prior to what we call Old Kannada (haḷagannaḍa), exemplified by the writing of the tenth-century poets Pampa and Ranna.\(^{499}\) I assign the shift from pūrvahaḷagannaḍa to haḷagannaḍa to Śrivijaya's Kavirājamārgam in which we find the first attempt to construct Kannada as a cosmopolitan literary language in the image of Sanskrit. What is often not emphasized enough is that Śrivijaya's text is the product of an intense anxiety around a pre-existent form of writing (pūrvakāvyaracane) written by earlier poets (purātanakavi) whom he critiques both in terms of grammar and poetics.\(^{500}\) And yet, even despite attempts to standardize Kannada around Sanskritic norms, traces of a more distinctly Dravidian style of writing persists prominently in the tenth-century prose writing of Cāvuṇḍarāya, the previously mentioned Śivakoti, and, most notably within epigraphical writing. In the text of these two authors as well as in the larger domain of inscriptions, we find a non-standard verb conjugation—perhaps a persistent older literary or oral form—that contains an "o" paired with a consonant ending rather than the standard Old Kannada "a" paired with a consonant ending.\(^{501}\) For example, in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ, we find emboł

\(^{499}\) For more on pre-Old Kannada (pūrvahaḷagannaḍa) see R.S. Mugali, History of Kannada Literature (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1975), 5.

\(^{500}\) KRM, vv. 1.9 {kanda} and 1.33 {kanda}. Indeed, Śrīvijaya's Kavirājamārgam is commonly identified as the "first" piece of Kannada literature. A closer reading of the text makes such a temporal attribution impossible given that Śrīvijaya's task was to critique a previously existent mode of writing Kannada poetry and to improve upon it through the grafting of a Sanskritic poetic model onto Kannada. What appears to us as the "first" Kannada literary text is an archival effect wherein the extant appears as the inaugural.

\(^{501}\) A. Velupillai makes a fascinating observation that Tamil inscriptions seem to be a residual site of colloquial style language. Velupillai, “Viracoozhiyam as a Grammar of
(“she is called”) and puṭṭidol (“she is born”) rather than embal and puṭṭidal and embon (“he is called”) and puṭṭidon (“he is born”) rather than emban and puṭṭidan.\textsuperscript{502} Despite arguments that suggest that Kannada literature “commenced” with the Sanskritized linguistic and literary vision put forward in the tenth-century Kavirājamārgam, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam provocatively suggests that a more Dravidian literary idiom was simultaneously also available for the purposes of writing literature.

What does this language and literary style do for the reader? Devoid of the long Sanskritic compounds of Pampa and rendered into a more Dravidian idiom (both in terms of grammar and lexicon), the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam is, on a formal level, simply a far more accessible text to read. The readability of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s prose along with his use of Dravidian linguistic and literary registers stand in stark contrast to the rarified and courtly style of Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam or his Vikramārjunavijayam. By incorporating Pampa into a radically different genre and style, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text toggles between an ideal reader familiar with Pampa and able to pleasurably recognize the translation, adoption, and emendation of Pampa’s words within the text, as well as a reader for whom such prior knowledge and literary training was simply unnecessary. One does not have to know Pampa to read Cāvuṇḍarāya, although it might increase one’s pleasure. However, one does already have to know the story of the Ādipurāṇa to read and understand
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\textsuperscript{502} On these two types of verbal conjugations, Narasimhia says, “Since these –on forms are found in the inscriptions of different and distant parts (so far made available), it is not possible to assume that the –an and the –on forms are dialectical variations. The gradual decrease in the number of –on and the –or forms in the inscriptions and their replacement by –ar and –avar forms can be seen from the following list:—keyvor (I. Ant. X 61) C. 700 A.D.…” Narasimhia, A Grammar of the Oldest Kanarese Inscriptions, 168.
Cāvuṇḍarāya. The *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* accommodates both of these readers. But in turning to a Dravidian prose style, Cāvuṇḍarāya addresses an audience already well versed in Jain scriptures and narrative. If, as I argued in chapter three, Jinasēna’s Sanskrit *Ādipurāṇa* marks a turn towards the language and literature of the court as a new avenue through which to circulate Jainism, then the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* marks an important shift away from the hermetic horizons of the court to the cultivation of a decidedly Jain audience.

What effect, then, does this shift specifically have on the narrative of the *Ādipurāṇa*? The literary embellishment and poetic lingering of Jinasēna and Pampa are stripped away in Cāvuṇḍarāya. This is not to say the text is not poetry, but a poetry that produces a very different set of effects/affects on the reader that I will explore further below. Instead of lingering, the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* moves the reader quickly through a distilled set of narrative highlights and, in so doing, creates an almost rhythmic quality to the writing. This is most prominent in the genealogical accounts, accounts that are repeatedly given by clairvoyant Jain sages, of the central characters’ past lives. For example, after Ādinātha's liberation, one of his sons, Ṛṣabhasēna, now a Gaṇadhara or leader of the nascent Jain monastic community, narrates the *bhavāvali*, or the continuum of all the characters’ interwoven lives. He says:

Jayavarma became Mahābala, Lalita, Vajrājaṅgha, an Ārya, Śrīdhara, Suvidhi, Achyutēndra, Vajrābhi, and Ahamindra. He then became Vṛṣabhanātha. Dhanaśri became Nīrnāmike, Svayamprabhe, Śrīmati, an Ārye, Swayamprabhadēva, Kēśava, Praṅdrha, Dhanadatta, and Ahamindra. He then became Śrēyaṃsa, the giver of charity to a Jīna or Tīrthaṅkara (dānatīrthakaraṃ). Atigṛddha became Nāraka, Vyāghra, Divākaraprabha, Mativara, and Ahamindra. You then became Bharata. Sēnāpati became an Ārya, Prabhaṅkara, Akampana, Ahamindra, Mahābāhu, and Ahamindra. He then became Bāhubali. The minister became and arrived as an Ārya, Kanakaprabha, Ānanda, Ahamindra, Pītha, and Ahamindra. He then became Vṛṣabhasēna. The priest became and arrived as an Ārya, Prabhaṅjana, Dhanamitra,
Ahamindra, Mahāpīṭha, and Ahamindra. He then became Anantavijaya. Ugrasēna became and arrived as a lion, Ārya, Citrāṅgada, Varadatta, a Sāmānika god, Vijaya, and Ahamindra. He then became Anantavīrya. Hariva-ra became and arrived as a boar, an Ārya, Maṇikuṇḍala, Varāṣeṇa, a Sāmānika god, Vaijayanta, and Ahamindra. He then became Acyuta. Nāgadatta became a monkey, an Ārya, Manōhara, Citrāṅgada, a Sāmānika god, Jayanta, Ahamindra. He then became Vīra. Lōlupa became a mongoose, an Ārya, Manōratha, Śāntamadana, a Sāmānika god, Aparājita, and Ahamindra. He then became Suvīra.

Similar genealogical accounts are also present in Jinasēna and Pampa to be sure, but they take on a greater prominence in Cāvuṇḍarāya with their repetitive syntactical structures that loll the reader into the repetitious and tiresome experience of being locked in the cycle of rebirth. Each character's previous lives are identically composed with little variation. Indeed, devoid of poetic devices and pretensions the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ comes to read like one long bhavāvali.

3. Making Sense of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ and the Paucity of Literary Historical Models

There are only two available premodern literary historical models through which...
to make sense of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ; on the one hand, Sheldon Pollock’s model of secular vernacularism and, on the other, devotional vernacularism. In the first instance, it is tempting to describe the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ as a “vernacular” text as I have done at least once in the description of the text given above. After all, it is written in a regional language, that is, the very definition of the vernacular. However, the word vernacular is today no longer simply a descriptive word, but a term loaded with conceptual significance within the study of South Asian languages and literatures. Following the work of Sheldon Pollock, scholars use the word vernacular in a very particular sense: to describe a literary style in which a regional language becomes a language of literature through the grafting on of a Sanskritic model. Working with this theory of vernacularization, it is Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ or Vikramārjunavijayaṃ—with their heavily Sanskritized lexicons, compounds, meters, and aesthetic norms—and not the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ that is the paradigmatic vernacular text. Emerging out of Pollock’s ideal-typical model of tenth-century Kannada as envisioned in the Kavirājamārgam, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ highlights the inadequacy of our models of vernacularity and vernacularization; what a vernacular language is, what it could be, and how it came to be used for the purpose of writing literature. At the precise moment that Kannada literature of the tenth century is supposed to be undergoing a Sanskrit lexical and aesthetic invasion that make it into a “vernacular” language, we have in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ an author meticulously picking through and changing his words to reflect a Dravidian idiom. Although Cāvuṇḍarāya understood Jain literary production in Sanskrit and Kannada as interrelated phenomena, his vision of Kannada as a literary language was not constructed on a Sanskritic model and, therefore, does not align with
the vision of Kannada put forth in the *Kavirājamārgam* nor Pollock’s broader interpretation of the period.

The model of vernacularity put forward by Pollock is an avowedly courtly rather than popular endeavor. This makes sense: beyond the populace of the Deccani courts, it is hard to imagine a necessarily equipped readership for Pampa’s complex and highly Sanskritized *campū* poetry. What, then, are we to make of the dramatic shift in linguistic register and literary style of the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ*, composed a mere thirty-seven years after Pampa’s *Ādipurāṇaṃ*? As previously noted, Cāvuṇḍarāya writes in a far more vernacularized Dravidian idiom and with a very different poetic sensibility than what was current in elite literature of that moment. Given that Cāvuṇḍarāya chose not to write in *campū*, the courtly genre and style that he himself patronized, then perhaps it is not unreasonable to suppose that he was not writing for a courtly audience at all. If that was the case, then it does not make sense to attempt to assess his work within that framework. Instead of Pollock’s model of vernacularization tied as it is to the court, it is tempting to analyze the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* as a vernacular devotional text, that is a *bhakti* text, the other predominate lens through which premodern vernacularization in South Asia has been understood. At the level of language—namely, its accessible Kannada lexicon and style—, the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* seems in conversation with the *bhakti* poetic traditions current in South India at this moment. After all, in this region there is and was a deep connection between local language, literary style, and devotion to a locally embedded deity. A.K. Ramanujan, a renowned scholar of both Tamil and Kannada *bhakti*, reminds us time and again that the divine demands intimacy through one’s mother
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tongue (tāy moḷī in Tamil and tāyi nuḍī in Kannada); “god lives inside us as a mother tongue does, and we live in god as we live in language…” Even when composed in a self-consciously courtly style, bhakti, at least in South India, sought to address the divine in such a way that, while not necessarily always popular, engendered a certain affective intimacy.

To this end, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text in some ways formally seems to fit the style of the bhakti poetic model, but the matter of affect remains a more broadly vexing question for the study of Jainism and devotionalism, a question that I will return to later on in this chapter in the context of the devotional practices that emerge around Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Bāhubali statue. Scholarship on South Indian bhakti typically describes its affective register through such terms as “fanatical” (often to the point of violence), “frenzied,” “passionate,” and “intimate.” In contrast, the affective tonality of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam can only be described as distanced and flat; a perspective hinted at in the detached, list-like quality of the bhavāvali quoted in the section above. In this case, the colloquialism or register of a regional language does not equal intimacy. The question
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then becomes, can we have a dispassionate bhakti? And, how can we account for the different affective registers that animate Jain “vernacular” texts such as the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam as opposed to Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava equivalents? Or are they equivalents at all?

We simply do not have a name for the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam’s linguistic register, poetic style, and broader literary orientation within our received secular or even religious literary models for this time and place.

Working outside the framework of vernacular secularism and vernacular devotionalism, I offer two possible readings of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam. First, perhaps this text is still a courtly text, but of a different kind or order. If we take seriously the proposition that Cāvuṇḍarāya incorporated Kaviparamēśvara’s earlier Ādipurāṇa narrative and read that alongside his clear appropriation of Pampa’s prose vacanas then the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam comes into view as a literary compendium and distillation of earlier works. That is to say, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam combined and made more accessible popular courtly texts of the day through selective quotation and summary rewriting that transformed epic Sanskrit kāvya and Kannada campū into readable prose. Furthermore, given Cāvuṇḍarāya patronage of Ranna’s Ajitapurāṇam—the narrative of the second Tīrthaṅkara Ajitasēna and, therefore, the second story of the sixty-three great men—, it seems possible, if not probable, that Cāvuṇḍarāya continued with the practice of direct adoption and compilation of other earlier or contemporary poet’s works into the second chapter of his mahāpurāṇa. Although to conclusively substantiate this reading of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam requires further research on the relationship between the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam and Ranna’s Ajitapurāṇam, currently outside the scope of this dissertation. Regardless, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam is interpretable through the
framework of the literary compendium. Read from this angle, this text speaks to a moment when the court was not the monolithic audience that we might imagine through our to hand collapse of Sanskrit kāvyā into court poetry. The Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ as literary compendium poses that the dense Sanskrit kāvyā and complex Kannada campū was even beyond the abilities of some quarters of the court. Alternatively, or in compliment, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ could be further read as a moment when elite literary knowledge became in demand in spaces and by communities outside the court. Within these imagined scenarios, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ, then, functioned much like a commonplace book or locus communis, providing a digest of desirable literary knowledge for the court itself or for outside readers.

If the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ can be read as a literary compendium or commonplace book then, maintaining a not all together dissimilar structure, it can also be understood as an aide-mémoire for the medieval Digambara community. While the religiosity of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ is not frenetic, ecstatic, or emotional in a bhakti sense, it does presume an audience of pious devotees. The text imagines an audience that knows the story of the Ādipurāṇa and the broader sixty-three great heroes of the Jain tradition and just needs a prompt to be reminded of what they already know. In this way, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ acts as a mnemonic device in which the reader is not told the entire story, but is given a piece or reference to a story that activates a pre-existent knowledge. In the bhavāvalī or genealogical account of the lives of the main characters given previously, we find the line “Sēnāpati became an Ārya, Prabhaṅkara, Akampana, Ahamindra, Mahābāhu, and Ahamindra. He then became Bāhubali.” Here a mere list of names is meant to refer back to an interconnected set of stories of Bāhubali’s past lives.
that a pious Jain reader would already know. Cāvuṇḍarāya only has to give a sparse account or even just mention a character’s name in order to draw the reader into a narrative world with which they are already deeply familiar. Moreover, the winnowing of the Ādi narrative in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ results in a winnowing of affective intensity. The lengthy transmigratory love stories that preoccupy Pampa in the previous chapter are reduced to mere lines, gutted of their emotional intensity in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ. Similarly, the gruesome and disgusting depictions of hell in both Jinasēna and Pampa simply do not appear here. Instead, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ creates a literary space in which the reader is invited to remember what they already know and emotionally respond in a way they have already felt. As the Magnetic Fields put it, “and you used to love me that way / so you know how to love me that way.”

This section explored the available secular and religious models through which to interpret premodern vernacular literature and the inapplicability of those models as an interpretative framework for the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ. Instead, I proposed two possible readings of the text as a courtly literary commonplace book and as a religious aide-mémoire. Unfortunately, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text leaves us with more questions than answers: What kind of text is the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ? Was its genre, language, and style a novel and singular literary event or did it draw on extant forms of writing no longer visible in our contemporary archives? For whom was it written? What kinds of audiences did it solicit? Was its register courtly, elite, religious, or popular? What was its use? Rather than attempt to answer unanswerable questions—that is, questions outside our extant literary archives—, I will leave the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ as something of a question mark and, instead, suggest that Cāvuṇḍarāya’s literary experimentation speaks
to the enduring compellingness of the Ādipurāṇa genre and the mahāpurāṇa more broadly. Ninth- and tenth-century Deccani Digambara Jain poets—Jinasēna, Pampa, and Čāvuṇḍarāya—returned to the Ādipurāṇa time and again as a site of literary improvisation with language, genre, and style as well as a narrative through which to imagine ideal political and religious worlds harmonized around Jainism. If, as this dissertation proposes, the Čāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam is a further iteration of a Jain generic investment then what, in tandem with its novel formal literary features, did this text contribute to the Ādipurāṇa tradition?

4. Bāhubali and Bharata in Čāvuṇḍarāya's Textual and Visual Worlds

A further effect of Čāvuṇḍarāya's contracted and consolidated approach to writing the Ādipurāṇa is that certain sub-stories fall away while others become more significant alongside the central narrative of Ādinātha's rebirths on his way to liberation. After all, Čāvuṇḍarāya’s winnowed approach to the Ādipurāṇa does not evenly exfoliate the narrative; some elements remain contracted into mere lines and others fall away seemingly at random. For example, among the various sub-stories that come to fore, the Bāhubali and Bharata cycle is given greater prominence than it possessed in its earlier literary instantiations. I would argue that this is not random given the devotional program that develops in the medieval Deccan around this figure. Čāvuṇḍarāya curiously makes no mention of his monumental Bāhubali statue in the Čāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam, which certainly would have been under construction while the text was being composed. But, by narratively highlighting Bāhubali and Bharata, the readers of his text are attuned to the centrality of these characters in Čāvuṇḍarāya's textual and visual worlds. In this section, I argue that in the same way that the language and style of the Čāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam
opened up Jain literary form so too does the character and later, we shall see, the image of Bāhubali expand and invert the figurative life of sovereignty in Jainism beyond mundane kingship.

In Ādinātha’s final birth as King Rṣabha, he marries a pair of beautiful sisters named Yaśasvati and Sunande. Between them, Rṣabha’s wives staggeringly bear him a hundred sons and two daughters. Of particular note, Yaśasvati gives birth to a son named Bharata and Sunande a son named Bāhubali. Both sons fulfill cosmological roles within the structure of the sixty-three great men of the Jain tradition: Bharata is the first cakravartin (universal sovereign) and, as the text notes, Bāhubali is the first Kāmadēva (god of love) of the current cycle of Jain time. During their childhood and adolescence, which extends for twenty lacs span of time, Ādinātha trains his sons in specialized forms of knowledge that relate to their respective cosmological roles. Bāhubali is taught gemology (ratnaparīkṣe), the lore of elephants and horses (aśvatantra), medicine (āyurvēda), astrology (sāmudrika), and the science of desire (kāmatantra). Bharata is more narrowly educated in the precepts of governance (arhasāstra). After a long reign, the time for Rṣabha to renounce his kingdom arrives. However, the practice of Jain renunciation does not imply the destruction of the kingdom. After all, Jain Ādirūpāṇas are acutely concerned with the maintenance of mundane political sovereignty. As previously established, before a king can renounce he must ensure the continuity of his kingdom through an heir. To this end we are told that “Ādīdeva established Bharata and Bāhubali here as the kings of Ayōdhya and Podanapura, appointing them king (ādirāja)
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and heir apparent (yuvarāja).”

When Ādinātha renounces his kingdom, the narrative suspends its interest in the future Tīrthaṅkara and turns to his two sons Bharata and Bāhubali, the heir and the spare, who engage in one-on-one combat over the rights of royal inheritance. Within the larger framework of the Ādipurāṇa, the story of Bharata and Bāhubali thematizes the challenge of being both a Jain and a king in the context of tumultuous royal succession. Early in Bharata’s rule an interconnected set of three miraculous events (marked through the repetition of the word utpatti) take place: “the minister, the chief of the armory, and the head of the ladies chambers inform Lord Bharata about the arrival of Purudēva’s perfected knowledge (kēvalajñānōtpatti), the appearance of the cakra (cakrōtpatti), and birth of Prince Arkakīrti (arkakīrtikumārōtpatti).” Bharata first proceeds to worship his father’s perfected knowledge. Afterwards, he worships the cakra that had magically appeared in his treasury, signaling his status as cakravartin (and we can assume that he attends to his son’s birth after that). Inhabiting his newly elevated status as a cakravartin, Bharata then embarks on a digvijaya, a ritual conquering of the directions, one of the preeminent acts of medieval Indian kingship. Traversing the subcontinent in a clockwise fashion with his cakra majestically floating in front, Bharata easily conquers the directions across a span of 60,000 years. Upon seeing the Vṛsabha Mountain, he states, “‘I will write my panegyric of victory [vijayapraśasti] there.’ Atop the mountain he is filled with the pride of pouring rut at the sight of previous cakravartins’ vijayapraśastis.
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He rubs away a small space with a stick and inscribes his own with a cowry shell.”

But, as we will see, this triumphant act was a bit premature.

At the end of the *digvijaya*, Bharata returns to his capital city Ayōdhya, but his *cakra* stalls outside the gates and refuses to enter. After the grandiose and lengthy descriptions of Bharata’s conquest of the directions with the *cakra*, its immobility provokes a moment of narrative crisis in Jinasēna and Pampa. In contrast, this event in the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* is a non-event; yet another narrative moment that can be quickly glossed and dispensed with. To more fulsomely understand how the contracted prose form of the *Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ* relies upon and anticipates a reader thoroughly familiar with the Ādi narrative, I present an extended passage of this section from Jinasēna (on the left), Pampa (in the middle), and Cāvuṇḍarāya (on the right):
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511 nijavijayapraśastiyan alli bareyisuven endu pōgi pūrvacakravartigal vijayapraśastiyaṁ kaṇḍu galitamadan āgi edeyam danḍaratnaṁ orasi kaļedu vijayapraśastiyaṁ kākiṁratnadiṁ bareyisi. *CP*, 42.
At that time, the foremost military commander conveyed that news to the cakravartin. On account of hearing that, Bharata also felt considerable astonishment. He thought, “Why, indeed, has this cakra stumbled and stopped? Is it not under my complete subjection?” Everywhere, until now, its course has been unwavering. In this manner, he deliberated for a long time and invited his priest. The wise and patient man came and gravely spoke.

Words in the form of the Goddess Sarasvati, beautifully clear in meaning, emerged from his lotus like face. Those marvelous poetic ornaments are like the messenger of Jayaśri.

Having overrun the directions of the circle, terrified the circle of enemies, and humiliated the rays of the sun, why does the cakra refuse to approach the gate of my city?

Its behavior was unwavering in the conquest of all the directions, in the destruction of the eastern, southern and western directions, and in both the caves of the beautiful mountain.

Then why now does the cakra refuse to approach the gate of Ayōdhya?

The foremost military commander respectfully told Bharata Cakravarti about the faltering cakra. His mind faltered too at the prospect of the faltering cakra jewel since it was previously unwavering in its course. The astonished Cakravarti beckoned for his jewel of a priest.

“Among the fourteen jewels, this jewel of the cakra is central to me. Which god is better to me than this cakra? This cakra jewel has stopped and will not enter Ayōdhya. What is the cause for its halting?”

While entering Ayōdhya, the jewel of the cakra stood still and would not enter. The sight of the faltering cakra became the faltering of his mind.

“When it went inside the two caves of Rajata Mountain and to the oceans of the east, south and west, the cakra did not stand still for even a moment. And yet, why does the cakra stall at the city’s gate?”
cakra waver in my courtyard?
It is apparent that there is someone opposed to me who is desirous of conquering me.

Does there exist some unconquered foe in my portion of land? Or, is there a kinsman, of corrupt internal disposition, who is hostile to me?

Indeed, is there some causeless foe who does not salute me?
Generally, even the minds of wicked people stumble towards great souls.

With respect to the prosperity of others, the hearts of the great are free from envy. With respect to the prosperity of others, those of the lowly stature are jealous.

Or someone from my own tribe, who is burdened with envy, has not acquiesced to me.
Now the cakra has become crooked to eradicate that arrogance.

But upon further consideration, even some minor enemy should be destroyed. An ignored enemy afflicts like a particle of dust stuck in the eye.

Indeed, even a small thorn should be forcefully
extracted; 
if not removed from the foot, 
it will become extremely painful.

This celestial cakra is 
certainly the supreme and 
foremost of the jewels. There 
is no reason that it should 
waver in its movement.

Oh, Arya! Therefore, the 
[remaining] task fit to be 
done by this cakra is mere 
child’s play. 
Indeed, when indicated by 
the limb of the kingdom, 
then this turmoil cannot be 
due to a minor cause.

Oh, Intelligent Priest! 
Therefore, the cause is to be 
reflected on by you. Without 
deliberation, one cannot 
achieve success here nor in 
the world to come,

He said only this much 
with deep, lofty speech 
filled with heroic affect. 
The priest faced the 
faltering Cakravarti 
Bharata.

When the jewel of the priest 
was asked about this…..

While you have a divine eye, 
this proper understanding of 
what is to be done endures. 
Who else other than the sun 
can destroy the darkness?

In this manner having 
communicated what was to 
be done with measured 
speech to his astrologer, the 
king became silent. 
Generally, powerful people 
use measured speech.

Then the priest spoke tender, 
deep words filled with poetic 
ornaments in order to 
persuade Lord Bharata.
It is sweet. It is powerful. It exhibits cleverness with words. The meaning found in your speech does not occur anywhere else.

We only know the śāstras; we are not conversant in their practical applications. Who else is knowledgeable in the application of the śāstras and in the science of rule in the same way as you?

You are the preeminent king [ādirāja] and the royal sage [rājarṣi]. That knowledge begins with you. Who are we to use it in front of someone so knowledgeable? How are we not embarrassed?

“You are the first Cakravarti. The four types of royal knowledge [sāma, dāna, bhēda, and daṇḍa] are born to you. On account of that, good conduct is yours alone.” He said, “Foolish people like me, what else will they ask you?”

“Shall we also imitate the practice of irrational people who worship the wish-fulfilling tree with fruit, the ocean with water, the divine preceptors with speech, the sun with light?”

In that manner, the kind treatment, of unparalleled scope, which you shown to us increases our prestige in the world. That being so, we are intent on speaking.

“Oh, Lord! The teachings on...
The fate have been handed down to us that the *cakra* does not rest until the remaining directions are conquered.

Therefore, this triumphant weapon of yours, formidable with blazing rays, incomprehensively lingers at the gate of the city as if paralyzed. The enemy, enemy of a friend, friend, and friend of a friend are handed down orally. Oh, Lord! But in your rule these subjects remain merely in the act of hearing.

Even so, there remains some faction of yours still to be conquered. That cruel one is sleeping well in your internal house like a disease in the belly.

The external sphere was, indeed, conquered by you. But today doubt it born about the purity of the internal sphere.

Among the factions to be conquered, your brothers will not submit. Those ones swerving from duty who are of your lineage cannot be destroyed.

A powerful person, even though great, is blocked by his own kin. This is illustrated by the blazing sunstone blocking the sun.

Even someone from within not exist, then this faltering *cakra* would not reveal the existence of hostile enemies. In this way, is it not so that they are difficult to view like the sphere of the sun that illuminates the door of Ayōdhya, the best of cities?

“We have heard in the *śāstras* about the twelve kings. Not only that, is it possible to see them on the earth surrounded by the salty ocean? Oh, Lord! On that shinning land is your name alone.”

“Oh, King! Much of this year went to conquering the external sphere. Listen! Next is the purification of the internal sphere. Without forgetting that, hereafter, I will make it known.”

“’He is the child of Puru and we are also the sons of Puru. This land was given to us by our father. Is it an obstacle to him? We live according to what is entitled to us. Out of pride, we will not bow.’”
the same clan who is weak
having obtained a zealous
guide will destroy the king
like the handle of the axe
destroys the earth.

These your brothers are
invincible, powerful, and are
abounding in arrogance.
Foremost among your
younger brothers is Bāhubali
who is courageous and
powerful.

Your ninety-nine brothers
abound in valor. They
decreed, “We do not bow to
anyone but to the mighty
first guru.”

Oh! Bearer of the Cakra!
Therefore, you should
quickly rectify this matter.
The learned do not overlook
even the smallest trace of
debt, offense, fire, and
hostility.

Oh King! By you alone, this
earth is governed by a good
king. Let there not be a bad
king who has the condition
of having a divided
kingdom.

Oh Lord! While you are
king, the title “king” [rāja]
should not illuminate another
soul. While a lion exists,
how can a deer bear the title
“lord of beasts” [mrgēndra]?

Oh Lord! Your brothers,
with their envy shaken off,
let them obey you.

“All of your younger
brothers have elevated
self-regard. They will not
bend even a little bit.
Among the brothers, the
hero Bāhubali exhibits
powerful strength of arm
and extreme self-conceit.
He will not bow first.”

“‘I am the lord of this earth
given by Ādibrahma.
However great Bharata’s
kingdom, what is it to
me?’ Oh Lord! Bāhubali
has grown strong with
rising pride.”

What is said to you? He
has desire for ruinous sport
born from the arrogance of
his arm engaged in battle
with a great warrior. He is
drunk with the desire for
the exertion of play like
the pillar like tooth of an
hostile elephant. He has
unrestrained longing to
bring down victory upon
the heads of
unconquerable and
deceitful kings with puffed
up valor. He is an abode
for musical gatherings for
the telling of roguish
stories.

In this way, the priest said,
"Oh, Lord! All the princes
bowed to you

But Bāhubali and the rest of
your brothers, they say ‘We
will not prostrate before you.’
On account of their pride, the
cakra has stopped here and
will not enter.

But only that, if another
powerful man appears on
the earth, is it not
According to the śāstras, they should obey you who are the oldest and the foremost of this era.

The messengers having strategically approached them and brought them around should make them obedient to your authority. They should do so according to your command. Otherwise, they might speak out of line.

In the case that one who has puffed up false pride does not submit your authority, alas, he would destroy and the petty kings under your control.

It is undesirable to share the kingdom and a married woman. One who enjoyed them with another is not a man, but rather a cow.

After approaching you with great longing, let them bow down to you. Or, let them go and take refuge with the Lord Jina who protects the world.

There are only two paths; there is no third path for them. Let them enter your court or the forest where they will be the same as forest animals.

By being noncompliant, one’s own family burns like a piece of kindling for a fire.

impossible to have a good king? It will be ruled by a bad king. Oh! Lord of the earth! Be a good king to the land.

When he sent the messengers with instructions to the princes, those conceited men refused to bow down.

“Devotion has greatly grown inside their minds. Let them enter the land of your court or let them enter the forest, Other than that, no other place is available to them. Send the messengers.”

“Oh, Lord Bharata! Let them experience pleasure having bowed down to your lotus feet. Or let them experience asceticism having bowed down to the lotus-feet of the first supreme lord.”

Instead, they decided to accept asceticism at the base of the feet of their guru.
Those who are compliant are the supreme joy of the leader.

Let your brothers—their envy set aside, peaceful and submitted to you with their heads bowed—let them happily prosper desirous of your favor.

Thus, the wise, chief priest of the king, that knower of the śāstras, gave instruction. Even having accepted that which was to be done, in that moment, the cakravartin became angry. Reddened from anger, his eyes caused redness to obtain to all the directions as if giving a blood sacrifice to the women of the directions though his mental indignation.

Jinasēna, Pampa, and Cāvuṇḍarāya share in the initial framing of this moment; the faltering of the cakra outside the city gates presents Bharata with a baffling problem that requires the assistance of a priest. Unsurprisingly, given their previously established intertextuality, they also share in a certain poetic vision in which the faltering (skhalana) of the cakra is equated with the faltering of Bharata’s mind as well as a certain playfulness with the elasticity of the term cakra to name a discus weapon or a circle more generically (as in the circle of enemies, the sun, etc…). After this opening conceit, Cāvuṇḍarāya breaks with the explanatory program in Jinasēna and Pampa. Cāvuṇḍarāya’s version of the priest simply informs Bharata that his brothers’ defiance to his rule is the cause of the cakra’s immobility. Moving from direct quotation, we are then told that Bharata has sent emissaries to his brothers and, again, instead of submitting to him they have chosen to renounce at the feet of their father Ādinātha. While
Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text is a distillation of the facts and actions that are also found in Jinasēna and Pampa, we do not really know why any of the characters (including the cakra) behave in the ways that they do. The affective tension that drives the narrative (and explains the characters actions), the sophisticated interpretation, and the complex language found in Jinasēna and Pampa is completely absent in Cāvuṇḍarāya.

Perhaps unsurprisingly given my earlier reading of the text in chapter three, Jinasēna’s version of events is the most elaborate and lengthy of the three by far. Bharata calls for his priest and regales him with self-reflexive questions that betray the king’s deep-seated anxiety and, perhaps, insecurity. He worries that one of his own kinsmen must be the cause. After engaging in mutual flattery, the priest declares that the cakra will not rest until the directions are conquered so its current paralysis is puzzling. The priest concludes that there must be an enemy inside Bharata’s own house. To illustrate the point he declares that Bharata has conquered the “external sphere” (bahirmanḍala) but has yet to conquer the “internal sphere” (antarmanḍala). This language, laden with double valency, can be read as describing Bharata’s current political situation as well as his current state of moral development in which the external sphere and not the internal sphere is the focus. The priest continues by describing the defiant state of Bharata’s brothers and, in particular, Bāhubali. He directs Bharata to send them a messenger and to

512 Jains writers used the contrastive power of the “internal” versus the “external” to great literary effect. For example, Haribhadra’s Samaraīccakahā, written at a very different time and place, commences with, “‘Blessed One, how can I make my way safely through the forest that is the cycle of rebirths? And once I cross the forest, where will I be?’ The monk replied, ‘Listen. There are two forests; one is the forest that exists outside us, in nature, and the other is the forest that is within us, the tangle of our thoughts and desires. Let me use the forest that exists in nature as a parable to teach you of the other, equally treacherous forest....’” Phyllis Granoff, The Forest of Thieves and the Magic Garden: An Anthology of Medieval Jain Stories (New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1998), 1.
give them an ultimatum; either submit to Bharata’s authority or take Jain renunciation at
their father Ādinātha’s feet. Hearing the priest’s analysis of the situation and his options,
Bharata is enraged. Pampa closely follows the account of the narrative given by Jinasēna
down to the vocabulary of the internal and external spheres, but he makes an important
addition by adding a collective quote of the band of ninety-eight brothers and a direct
quote from Bāhubali. Through these quotations, we learn that Bharata’s brothers feel
equally entitled to their share of the kingdom because, like Bharata, they are all sons of
Ādinātha. The elaboration of sentiment (be it the brother’s pride or Bharata’s anger)
found in Jinasēna and Pampa primes the reader for how to respond, but also complexifies
any available response. For example, the brothers’ pitiful claim that they too are the sons
of Ādinātha and he gave them their land, points to the impossibility of the situation. Who
is right? Bharata who wants to govern the land as its sole king (given that we are told that
divided kingdom is no good)? Or his brothers, who just want to hold onto what they feel
rightfully entitled to? The impossibility of this situation is completely lost in
Cāvuṇḍarāya and the interconnections between the cakra’s paralysis, the brother’s
defiance, the ministers words, and Bharata’s acts are similarly severed. Unless the reader
already knows the story and its emotional valence, it is hard to make sense of
Cāvuṇḍarāya’s rendering of this scene.

To return to the larger summary of the Bāhubali and Bharata cycle, Bharata sends
a message requesting submission to all his brothers save Bāhubali. Rather than submit to
his rule, they accept asceticism at the feet of their guru, Ādinātha. He sends an especially
skilled messenger to similarly persuade Bāhubali, but to no avail. The two brothers
prepare their armies for battle. Their respective ministers meet and marvel at the
impending devastation. “They remark, ‘What is the point of causing the destruction of all the people?’ They negotiate with each other and convince Bharata and Bāhubali to participate in a dharmic battle rather than engage the two armies.” Bāhubali quickly bests Bharata in a one-on-one staring match and a water fight. He then roundly defeats him in a wrestling match by picking up the humiliated king and holding him aloft over his head. Bharata, deeply embarrassed, vengefully shoots the cakra at his brother. Instead of striking Bāhubali, the cakra simply circles him and stands still. Shocked by his own behavior, Bharata falls to ground, clasps his brother’s leg, and begs him to take over the kingdom. Bāhubali replies, “It is not useful to me whatsoever.” He then focuses his mind on austerities. He stands for the span of one year in pratimāyoga during which time creeper vines climb up the length of his body. After his brother Bharata comes to him, Bāhubali overcomes his pride, his final obstacle to liberation, and achieves the liberatory knowledge of kēvalajñāna.

Highlighted and neatly condensed in the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam, the Bāhubali and Bharata narrative cycle establishes a radical alternative to the predominate narrative of the Ādipurāṇa in which kingship is pursued, relished, maintained, and then renounced. Instead, here, we find the character of Bāhubali in militant pursuit of his father’s kingdom only to realize its worthlessness in contrast to the spiritual realm of liberation. Bāhubali is a composite figure; a god of love, a worldly hero, a would-be king, and, ultimately, a Jain renunciate. In Jinasēna, Pampa, and to a lesser extent Cāvuṇḍarāya, Bāhubali’s bodily strength (his name quite revealingly means “strong-armed”) are intertwined with a

513 sakalajanakṣayakaram adaṇḍoḷ ēvandapudu endu tammoḷe samakaṭṭi dharmayuddhakke bharatabāhubaligalāṇaṇa oḍambaḍisì bālam eraḍu midukade. CP, 49.
514 Ibid.
commentary on his renowned political wisdom (nīticuṅcu) that make him invincible to force (daṇḍasādhya). Bāhubali’s immunity to physical assault does not derive from his corporeal power, but rather the ways in which such a cultivated external state reflects an equally cultivated inner state of political know-how that is essential to the successful execution of power. Recognizing this, Bharata consistently singles out Bāhubali from the larger band of brothers as necessitating both extra political care and caution as well as enhanced respect. If Jinasēna establishes kingship as a privileged path of liberation, which acts as both a hallmark of moral development as well as a heightened sensorium of human experience that itself leads to the moral perfection of liberation, then the figure of Bāhubali represents the logical conclusion of the twinning of kingship and renunciation. I read Bāhubali’s renunciation as a radical political act, producing a body so internally sovereign that it no longer cares for worldly sovereignty. One might fairly ask, isn’t renunciation a religious act? Yes. But if we take seriously the notion that Jains robustly theorized the political then we have to make inoperative a contemporary understanding of the political and open up an historical moment when religious acts could be activated for political purposes. For Bāhubali kingship is not a path of renunciation; instead, he liberates himself from kingship rather than through kingship. Through this figure, the previously established continuum of kingship and renunciation is collapsed and inverted.

515 JĀP, v. 35.12.
Bāhubali, the would-be king, stands out starkly among the cast of kingly characters that populate the Ādipurāṇa. And for Cāvuṇḍarāya, we know Bāhubali was a particularly compelling figure. In 981 C.E., Cāvuṇḍarāya consecrated a fifty-seven-foot colossus of a meditating Bāhubali that he commissioned at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa (fig. 5.1). Images of Bāhubali alongside the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara Pārśvanātha appear in bas-relief at the sixth- and seventh-century Jain caves at Badāmi (Figs. 5.2 & 5.3) and Aihoḷe and were central to the iconographic program of the ninth-century Jain caves of Ellora (Figs 5.4 & 5.5). However, the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa—one of the tallest free-standing monoliths produced globally in the medieval period—was the first of its kind. The image captures Bāhubali engaged in his practice of a year-long meditation, standing upright in pratimāyōga—feet spread and arms hanging slightly away from the

The prominence of the Bāhubali story within the Ādipurāṇa tradition explored in this chapter is predated and buttressed by an equally, if not more, robust popularity within visual culture. Relief sculpture of the homage to a meditating Bāhubali emerged as one of the most distinct themes of the Chālukya and Rāṣṭrakūṭa visual imperium that predates Jinasēna's first extant elaboration of the narrative in the ninth century. Indeed, we find the earliest artistic representation of Bāhubali in the sixth-century Cāḷukya rock-cut Jain cave at Bādami. Located on the left-hand side of upper cave’s maṇḍapa, or pillared veranda, stands Bāhubali meditating in kāyotsarga position, with long locks of hair resting on his shoulders, vines climbing up his powerful legs, anthills and snakes springing up at his feet, and Bharata along with their sisters Brahmī and Sundāri stand and kneel in homage (Fig. 5.2) On the right-hand side of the veranda is a high-relief sculpture in the same style of Kamathopasa Pārśvanāṭh (Fig 5.3). This is a particular image of Pārśvanāṭh that details his attack by the demon Sambara and his protection by two snake guardians. A strikingly similar layout to Badami is found at the closely contemporary Cāḷukya Jain cave on Meguti hill at Aihoḷe. The ninth-century Rāṣṭrakūṭa rock cut cave temple complex at Ellora includes approximately nineteen sets of this pair within the Jain caves. The pairing of these two figures became a significant theme in the visual imperium of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Cāḷukyas, yet the popularity of these images was not confined to the Western Deccan. We find images of Bāhubali and Pārśvanāṭha in the former domains of the Pallavas, Paṇḍyas, and Cōḷas in Tamil speaking region including at Kāraikōyil, Kalugumalai, Melsittamur, Tirakkol, Tirumalai among others.
body—with flowering creeper vines circling up his thighs and arms. His finely chiseled face bears a peaceful countenance and, indeed, in the world of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text and built onto the landscape of the Deccan, Bāhubali represents the aesthetic culmination of peace or śānta; the only affect available to ascetic dispassion. Anthills intertwined with snakes encircle his feet. The creepers and the anthills visually signal the expanse of time Bāhubali has passed in meditation, but they also mask structures that support the weight of the statue’s immense arms. Stylistically, the body of the image inhabits the same iconographic program as standard images of Jinas: a nude image with a muscular physique, stocky thighs and broad shoulders, unnaturally long arms, earlobes of extended length, and a slight cranial bump or uṣṇīśa. Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Bāhubali monolith then amounts to a material interpretation of a literary text: it quite literally accords a density and heightened grandeur to a single moment of his narrative.

The colossal image is fashioned from light-grey granite that was likely carved in situ. Surrounded by an enclosure constructed by Gaṅga Rāja, a minister to Hoysaḷa King Viṣṇuvardhana, the image sits atop the larger of two hills, referred to as Vindhyagiri in Sanskrit and Dodda Beṭṭa in Kannada (Fig. 5.6). The appeal of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa for the construction of such an image probably lies in the popularity of the small hill (known as

518 The earlier bas-relief Bāhubalis at Badāmi, Aihoḷe, and Ellora as well as the Bāhubali monoliths constructed in the wake of the monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa all depict him standing upright in pratimāyōga in accordance with textual descriptions. However, Settar notes a unique seated image of Bāhubali at the Akhaṇḍa Bāgilu dated to the early twelfth century on Doḍḍa Beṭṭa at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. Settar, Inviting Death, 194-195. I am unaware of any other seated image of Bāhubali.

519 The difference, of course, between Bāhubali and a Jina is that while Bāhubali achieved liberation, he was not a ford-maker who deferred liberation to guide people on the Jain path.

520 EC Vol. 2, nos 75 & 76. Cāvuṇḍarāya, Gaṅga Rāja and Hulla form a triad of celebrated donors.
Candragiri or Cikka Beṭṭa) as a site for Jain monks and nuns to ritually fast to death through a practice known as *sallēkhanā* (Fig. 5.7 & 5.8). The *niṣidhi* memorial, which mark the deaths of these monks and nuns, represent one of the largest concentration of early inscriptions in the region starting from about the seventh century (Fig. 5.9).\(^{521}\)

S.Settar observes that even before the construction of the Bāhubali monolith the site was overrun with visitors clamoring to visit and observe these auspicious acts.\(^{522}\)

After the erection of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Bāhubali image, Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa shifted to a pilgrimage site focused around devotion to and the worship of the monolith. The shifting religious nature of the site is reflected in its many different names. As a place for the ritual practice of *sallēkhanā*, it was known in Sanskrit as Kaṭavapra and in Kannada as Kaḻbappu, Kaḻvappu, or Kaḻbappira, which Settar translates to “sepulchral hill.”\(^{523}\)

As a site for the devotion to Bāhubali it was transformed into the “new Pondanapura”

---

\(^{521}\) See S.Settar’s volumes *Inviting Death* and *Pursuing Death* for the culture of *sallēkhanā* at Śravaṇa Beḷagoḷa prior to its transformation into a pilgrimage site with the erection of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Bāhubali monolith. In early inscriptions the small hill is referred to as Kalbappu, Kalbappira (*EC* Vol. 2, no. 35), as well as Riṣigiri (Ibid., no. 34).

\(^{522}\) The number of pilgrims was such a problem that monks planning to practice *sallekhanā* began selecting other more remote sites.

\(^{523}\) Settar, *Inviting Death*, 94. He further notes that “Not all scholars agree on the definition of kaḻbappu or kaḻvappu as sepulchral hill. The root kaḻ is understood by some to mean ‘water’; by others, as meaning ‘dark colour’. Those who uphold the first definition believe that kaḻbappu indicates the white (bappu –bilpu) water (kaḻ). This interpretation is interesting because it corresponds to beḷ (white) gola (pond), and both these terms (kaḻbappu and belgola) probably indicated the same holy pond. Those who take kaḻ as kar (or black) argue that it denoted a hill (bappu), which was dark (kar) in colour…. We feel that it was not so much the colour as the ritual significance attached to the hill that influenced its nomenclature. If kaṭa is the Sanskrit root of the Kannada word kaḻ, both ought to connote identical meaning; this, indeed, would be the result if we carefully explore the various meanings of kaḻ. In Kannada, kaḻ means ‘to extricate’, ‘to unloose’, ‘to purge’, ‘to die’, while kaḻal means a state of emaciation (to become poor or thin) and kaḻivu, the end. These meaning approximate to the same as that of kaṭa (corpse, sepulcher), affirming thereby that this hill was a favourite haunt of saints and nuns for the voluntary termination of their life.” Ibid.
(abhinavapondanapura), or the new capital city of Bāhubali.\textsuperscript{524}

The Bāhubali image still stands remarkably unchanged and undamaged from when it was first installed in the tenth-century. The statue is most worn on its colossal toes, the most easily accessible part of Bāhubali’s body to touch and to worship regularly (Fig. 5.10). Starting in the twentieth century a uniform twelve-year schedule was instituted for the mahāmastakābhīṣēka or the colossal head anointing ceremony, during which a scaffolding is built around the image and Bāhubali is ritually bathed with water, milk, sugarcane juice, pastes of saffron, sandalwood, and turmeric as well as flowers.\textsuperscript{525}

However, in the medieval and early modern periods this event was celebrated with much less regularity. Kings, military generals, and Jain religious institutional leaders (bhaṭṭārakas and maṭhādhipatis) performed the mahāmastakābhīṣēka whenever the occasion, or more likely the financial ability, arose. In a maṇṭapa outside of the enclosure directly facing the Bāhubali statue stands a beautifully carved image of a Jain yakṣi dated to 1180 C.E., an image directly connected to the original act of bathing (Figs. 5.11 & 5.12). The attached inscription simply describes her as “Yakṣi-dēvati.”\textsuperscript{526} However, local lore recorded by Colonel Mackenzie, later textual sources, as well as the iconographic program tell a different story. These sources describe Cāvuṇḍarāya’s multiple failed attempts to perform a mahābhīṣēka of the statue. Standing on a platform above the monolith, he poured a mixture of five nectars (pañcāmṛta), but the liquid would drip only to the image’s navel. Even with the assistance of a priest, Cāvuṇḍarāya could not

\textsuperscript{524} S.P. Chavan, Jainism in Southern Karnataka up to AD 1565 (New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2005), 35.
\textsuperscript{525} Mackenzie records this event as happening every twenty years. Mackenzie, “Śrāvana Belligola,” IA 2 (1873): 129.
\textsuperscript{526} EC Vol. 2, no. 104, 161 (English), 103 (Kannada), 75 (transliteration).
complete the *abhiṣēka*. The goddess Kūṣmāṇḍinī (also thought to be the goddess Padmāvatī) appeared in the form of an old woman called Eggplant Granny (Gullekāyi Ajji) holding half an eggplant containing milk.\(^{527}\) Through her immense devotion the small quantity of milk covered the entire image, rolled down the hill, and flooded the town that skirts its base.\(^{528}\) The *yakṣi* image that stands outside the statue’s enclosure is the goddess in the form of Gullekāyi Ajji who we recognize by the iconographically peculiar eggplant clasped in her hands, rather than the traditional cluster of stylized mangos (Fig. 5.13).\(^{529}\)

The *mahāmastakābhiṣēka* and the more regular daily ritual bathing of the image’s feet are accommodated within the very materiality of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s statue. The monolith emerges out of a carved lotus flower with curved channels outlining the feet to funnel away liquid from the statue and into the rim of the lotus (Fig. 5.14). The anticipation of the statue’s ritual bathing is perhaps not particularly surprising given the centrality of the *abhiṣēka* within the broader religious culture of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism, particularly in South India.\(^{530}\) Within the politically charged context of a character drawn

---

\(^{527}\) Paul Dundas, *The Jains* (London: Routledge, 2002), 225. The goddess who appears as Gullekāyi Ajji is also often sometimes cited as Padmāvatī. *Gullekāyi* is an archaic word for eggplant. While *badane* is the most common word for eggplant in contemporary usage, the less common word *nelagulța* is likely etymologically linked to *gullekāyi*.


\(^{529}\) Mackenzie’s version of this story differs slightly than the one recorded by B.L. Rice in the introduction to *Epigraphia Carnatica* Volume 2 and repeated here. Mackenzie describes the Goddess Padmāvatī holding not an eggplant, but a small silver vase called a “belliyagoḷa” after which Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa was named. Mackenzie, “Śrāvana Belligoḷa,” 130.

from the Ādipurāṇa, this ritual is not simply religious, but recalls the fact that the
abhiṣēka is the political ritual of royal consecration.\(^{531}\) For example within the broader
Ādipurāṇa narrative, kings are lustrated upon the assumption of the throne as well as
after significant political acts, such as the digvijaya, and the baby Jina is elaborately
bathed by Indra as are Jina images in temples. These examples, drawn from both
religious and political domains, highlight them as ideologically interpenetrating worlds
that inhabit the same expressive vocabulary of power. With regard to the Bāhubali
monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, the abhiṣēka draws on and again collapses both registers of
power: to summarize Lisa Owens, it both purifies the image, but also replicates the
consecration of a king (rājyābhiṣēka).\(^{532}\) In so doing, the practice of
mahāmastakābhiṣēka ritually consecrates Bāhubali into the kingdom of liberation, a
spiritual dominion that I argue in my third chapter is consistently figured through
political concepts and language, and, as we see here, through ritual.

The statue also solicited and continues to solicit scalar forms of ritual. Kings,
associated figures in the court, and Jain religious leaders performed the
mahāmastakābhiṣēka, or the colossal head anointing, while regular lay-people performed
a simplified bathing (abhiṣēka) of the image’s toes. As previously noted, kingship is not
typically depicted through the arts of governance, but most typically rather through
rituals that are expressive of royal power. This has a long history within South Asia,

\(^{531}\) Ronald Inden states on this topic, “Indeed, virtually all of the rites having to do with
the making or remaking of a Hindu kingdom during the period of the Hindu kingdom’s
glory, the eight to twelfth century, consisted of a more or less elaborate bathing ceremony
either of the king of an image of a god…Virtually all of these baths were performed at
critical moments, as determined by the movements and conjunctions of heavenly bodies,
globes of light, whose activities indexed the will of the gods.” Ronald Inden, *Imagining
India* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 234.

stretching back to the symbolism of such royal rituals as the *aśvamēdha*, *digvijaya*, *hiranyagarbha*, and *tulāpuruṣadāna*. Great kings performed great rituals and this is how empires were affirmed and declared.\(^{533}\) The *mahāmastakābhīṣēka* of the Bāhubali statue became incorporated into this ritual economy, in which to be a king in the Deccan meant that one worshiped and ritually consecrated this colossal image. The inscriptive record at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa attests to the fact that king of the medieval and the early modern period were successfully incorporated into a devotional culture oriented around Bāhubali’s statue through the performance of the *mahāmastakābhīṣēka*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Patron</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181</td>
<td>Rudra of Bāgaḍage</td>
<td><em>EC</em> Vol. 2, no. 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>Paṇḍitārya</td>
<td><em>EC</em> Vol. 2, no. 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Acyutarai, Vijayanagara King</td>
<td><em>JSS</em> IV, 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Śāntavarni</td>
<td>Pañcabāṇa's <em>Bhujabali Carite,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Dodda Dēvarāja Woḍeyar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Dodda Dēvarāja Woḍeyar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Cikka Dēvarāja Woḍeyar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Viśālakṣa Paṇḍita, the Jain</td>
<td>Anantakavi’s <em>Gommaṭēśvara Carite</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minister of Cikka Dēvarāja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woḍeyar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Mummadi Kṛṣṇarāja Woḍeyar III</td>
<td><em>EC</em> Vol. 2, no. 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Mummadi Kṛṣṇarāja Woḍeyar III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1871 | Observed by Mr. Scandon who used the scaffolding to measure the image for the first time. Recorded in Indian Antiquary by Colonel Colin Mackenzie.

03/03/1887 | Lakṣmīsēna Bhaṭṭāraka, the Bhaṭṭāraka of the Kolhāpur Maṭha | Recorded by B.L. Rice in the introduction to Epigraphia Carnatica Vol. 2

1900

03/30/1910

03/15/1925

03/24/1940 | Krṣṇarāja Woḍeyar IV & Prince Jayacāmarājēndra

03/05/1953

03/10/1966

03/30/1967

09/29/1980 | Attended by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

12/19/1993

07/18/2006

Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Bāhubali statue and its colossal scale *abhiṣēka* were novel developments within Jainism in the medieval Deccan. To begin, its monumental size is simply without precedent in medieval South Indian sculpture. Perhaps Cāvuṇḍarāya imagined his statue as accurately inhabiting the cosmo-mythological world of the *Ādipurāṇa* in which human life spanned thousands upon thousands of years and bodies stretched into the sky. After all, Bāhubali was said to be five hundred and twenty-five bow lengths tall so fifty-seven feet high seems like a reasonable attempt at an interpretation of that scale. Prior to this image, Digambara ritual and visual culture within
South India temples had already established several definitive features: Jinas were depicted with their eyes closed standing naked, a form of image that lends itself to the ritual primacy of the *abhiṣēka* in which liquid dramatically cascades down the entirety of the human form.⁵³⁴ Cāvuṇḍarāya’s Bāhubali is an elaboration and amplification of a previously established culture of devotion to the Jina. But, at the same time, the monolith opened up hitherto unseen forms of Jain devotionalism that incorporated kings into a form of colossal ritual in which really only kings could afford to perform.

Up until this point, I have discussed the formal features of the image at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, its presence within that space, and the symbolism of the ritual culture that it solicits. But the statue is also a visual and material reading of the *Ādipurāṇa* narrative and is interpretable in this light as well. Through the monolith, Cāvuṇḍarāya positions its viewers in a particular relationship to Bāhubali, but also in relation to the broader narrative tradition. As you will recall, Bāhubali had been meditating for a year in *pratimāyoga* when his brother Bharata comes. In the more elaborate retellings found in Jinasēna and Pampa’s versions we are told that: “Bharata, the foremost among kings, came and bowed at the lotus feet of Bāhubali, the king of sages. He honored him with various forms of worship.”⁵³⁵ This scene, I suggest, conditions the perspective of the viewers of the monolith: we inhabit the gaze of King Bharata. Modeled upon a literary Bharata and a literal Cāvuṇḍarāya, an ideal Jain king became one who worships Bāhubali, a figure who makes available a form of self-sovereignty divorced from the

---

⁵³⁴ The features of Digambara practice described here are in contrast to Śvētambara Tīrthaṅkara images that display prominent and open eyes, a clothed body, and are typically seated. These images are not bathed but, instead, offerings are placed or smeared at nine points on the limbs of the seated image in a form of worship called the nine-limb pūja. Babb, *Absent Lord*, 86.
practice of mundane kingship. The vision of renunciation as the natural outcome of correct kingship found in Jinasēna and Pampa is thus transformed by new literary and material sites that incorporate kings—along with their ministers, army generals, and queens—into novel forms of devotional practice drawn from and constructed around the Ādipurāṇa narrative. The deeply antinomian quality of this practice has been obscured by the routinization of the ritual culture around the Bāhubali monoliths; that is, these statues imagine a perfected world in which ideal Jain kings worship an image that embodies the very negation of kingship, a negation that more symbolically serves to negate the world itself. The monolith then importantly proposes a new model of devotional kingship through the gaze of Bharata while simultaneously promoting novel forms of self-sovereignty available to everyone through the image of Bāhubali.

While kings are imagined as the ideal devotees of the Bāhubali monolith, the image itself opens up the possibility for a much more inclusive devotional culture. The expansiveness of the audience imagined by this place is also signaled in the set of inscriptions that surround the monolith. The phrase “Śrī Cāmuṇḍa Rāja had it made” appears three times in three different languages and scripts: Marathi in nāgarī script (Fig. 5.16), Kannada in Haḷegannaḍa characters and Tamil in Tamil Grantha script (Fig. 5.17) and, significantly, not in Sanskrit.536 When one enters the Bāhubali enclosure the top of the statue is obscured and, instead, the viewer immediately sees the monolith’s feet surrounded by these large-scale inscriptions (the characters measure 3 feet 3.5 inches):

536 The inscription on the right-hand of the statue is the oldest recorded Marathi inscription. J. Bloch, Formation of the Marathi Language (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970), 290
monumental statues require equally monumental inscriptions. Whitney Cox recently suggested that, “Choice of language and choice of script seem to have interbraided in complex ways: the stability of the textual form of the corpus can be put in even higher relief by the dynamic, bi- or multi-lingual world seen in the wider epigraphical record and explicitly discussed by normative authorities.” Cāvuṇḍarāya’s inscriptions at the base of the Bāhubali statue embody this point. I argue that the predominance of regional languages over and above Sanskrit in this privileged inscriptive space at the foot of the monolith is not incidental; rather these inscriptions anticipate viewing publics who are fluent in these languages. Written in very large, neatly carved scripts, these inscriptions are clearly meant to be read by Kannada, Marathi, and Tamil pilgrims to Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa. The Bāhubali at this place epigraphically attempts to situate itself as a local pilgrimage site within the broader translocal landscape of South India and the Deccan.

Even though Digambara Jains were the conservative gender theorists of their day—not allowing that woman can achieve liberation without first being born a man—woman have always played a role at this site. If we think back to the story of Gullekāyi Ajji, Cāvuṇḍarāya, a powerful military general and Gaṅga feudatory, cannot complete the originary mahāmastakābhiṣēka of the monolith without drawing on the devotional power of a humble old woman. As noted, Cāvuṇḍarāya curiously does not mention or give an account of the statue or its construction in his Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ even though the statue was likely under construction while he was writing. Instead, the first description

537 EC Vol. 2, Introduction, 29. I am unaware of any other inscriptions in South Asia where the script is rendered at this scale. Indeed, more often than not, donative inscriptions and the like were not only inscribed at a small scale, but were often materially situated places where they were impossible to read.

538 Cox, “Scribe and Script in the Cālukya West Deccan,” 22.
we have a person visiting the Bāhubali image at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa occurs in Ranna’s Ajitapurāṇaṃ (993 C.E.), a poet contemporaneous to Cāvuṇḍarāya whom he also patronized. Ranna describes the scene as follows:

Attimabbe went to the lord of the Jinas of the lofty Kukkuṭēśvara for devotion to the Jina. Throwing rice as far as the eye can see, circling and climbing the mountain, Attimabbe became weary from the path near that Jina. An unseasonable rain suddenly materialized. Is this wonder because of my devotion to the Lord? Apprehend this rain truly as a rain of flowers!  

Here Attimabbe is described as climbing Vindhyagiri to see Bāhubali in the form of the Lord Kukkuṭēśvara—a title I will return to in the next section—when she begins to lag from fatigue, it is, after all, a difficult ascent. Soothing her weariness, she interprets the sudden and cooling rain shower as a sign of her devotion (bhakti) to Bāhubali. The fact that this first account of a pilgrim to the large hill at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa is a woman is not insignificant. Attimabbe, a fellow patron of the poet Ranna whom he calls a “a wish-fulfilling gem of charity” (dānacintāmani), is the most prominent female Jain donor and devotee of this period. Beyond the significance of Gullekāyi Ajji and Attimabbe’s gender and the broader audience to which this points, these two women’s religious sentiment is notably described through the idiom of devotion, or bhakti.

As I alluded to earlier, the term bhakti is more commonly associated with the violent, fanatical devotion of the twelfth-century Tamil nāyaṉmars than the ascetically oriented Jains. Yet, in an important article entitled “Bhakti in the Early Jain Tradition,”

 unnata kukkuṭēśvara jinēšvaranaṃ jinabhakte pōgi kā-ṇbannegam annamaṃ bisuṭu parvatamaṃ paridēre tajjinā sannadoḷ attimabbhe pathāśramam ädudakālavṛṣṭi-yā- yennado dēvabhaktigadu cōdyame koḷḷave puṣpavṛṣṭigaḷ | AP, 1.60
John Cort asks us to reconsider our received notions of bhakti along a continuum of practices that “can range from sober respect and veneration that upholds socioreligious hierarchies and distinctions to fervent emotional enthusiasm that breaks down all such hierarchies and distinctions in a radical soteriological egalitarianism.”\(^{540}\) (The worship of the Bāhubali monolith is typically, but not always a sober affair. In July 2013, I observed a pūja that involved playing the Bāhubali stōtra set to trance music over a blaring speaker while out of town male devotees clad in orange dhōtis ecstatically sang and danced in front of the statue) (Fig. 5.18).\(^{541}\) But typically impassioned sentiment is not constitutive of Jain practice and yet the tradition itself understands its devotees as participating in a culture of bhakti devotion. The archive that I have collected around the Ādipurāṇa tradition and the monolith and its attendant practices at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa have much to do with the creation of a devotional community. Regionally grounded within the local landscape of the Deccan, this community is bound together through a shared object of devotion that is Bāhubali and a shared subject position to that object. Just as the Cāvunḍarāya Purāṇam anticipated a knowledgeable and pious Jain community of readers so too did Cāvunḍarāya’s Bāhubali monolith anticipate and create a devotional Jain community.

Indeed, devotion to Bāhubali is quite unique to Digambara Jainism in the Deccan.

The tenth-century monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa inspired a series of replicas erected at

\(^{540}\) Cort, “Bhakti in the Early Jain Tradition,” 62

\(^{541}\) Glenn Yocum observed something quite similar while at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. He remarks, “On one of the Sundays I was there, I witnessed a remarkable (at least for me) display of hip-gyrating dancing in front of the big image by a group of north Indian pilgrims, all this to the accompaniment of the recorded, amplified sound of a ‘film’ Hindi devotional song.” Glenn Yocum, “‘On the Ground’ Jainism in South India” Religious Studies News 12.3 (1997): 5.
Gommaṭagiri in the twelfth-century C.E. (Fig. 5.19), Kārkaḷa in 1432 C.E. (Fig. 5.20), Vēṇūr in 1604 C.E. (Fig. 5.21), Kumboj in 1963 C.E. (Fig. 5.22), and Dharmasthala in 1973 C.E. (Fig. 5.23). Varying in height from twenty to fifty-seven feet, these images share an identical iconographic program modeled on the original monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa. Five of these images were produced in conversation with each other in relatively close proximity in Southern and Coastal Karnataka. The sixth image at Kumbhoj is located in the heavily Kannada-inflected space of Southern Maharashtra in what was formerly the domain of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire. Read collectively, these images reflect a landscape built in the Ādipurāṇa’s image, but they also persist in binding the Ādi narrative and, in particular, the figure of Bāhubali, to issues of kingship. After all in the medieval and early modern periods, much like the performance of the mahāmastakābhiṣēka, only kings could afford to construct Bāhubali monoliths. For example, besides the original at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, the two monoliths with the densest historical records are the Kārkaḷa and Vēṇūr images. The Kārkaḷa Bāhubali was constructed in 1432 C.E. by the petty chieftain Vīra Paṇḍya of the Bhairava Wodeyars. A mere twenty-two miles away, the Vēṇūr was similarly constructed in 1604 C.E by the Ajila king Timmarāja. When Immadi Bhairava became aware that the rival Ajilas were constructing their very own Bāhubali, he immediately waged war. Local lore records the Vēṇūr statue as being hidden in a nearby river for protection and, ultimately, consecrated after the feud was resolved. Set in a moment of proliferating petty kingdoms (Oḍeyars

542 The images arranged in order of size are Gommaṭagiri (20 ft.), Kumboj (28 ft.), Vēṇūr (38 ft.), Dharmasthala (39 ft.), Kārkaḷa (41.5 ft.), and Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa (57 ft.).
543 E. Hultzsch, “No. 14—Inscriptions of the Three Jaina Colossi of Southern India,” EI Vol. 7, inscription C.
544 Ibid.
and Nayakas) in the south western Deccan, this historical anecdote demonstrates how regional power became bound up in these Bāhubali statues. To be a king in this time and place was not only to worship Bāhubali, but to construct a Bāhubali monolith.

The centrality of this developing Bāhubali cult was not lost on early European observers of Jainism in this region. For example, during his tenure at the Mysore Survey from 1799-1808 during which time he surveyed the Bāhubali monoliths as Śravaṇa Belgoḷa and Kārkaḷa, Colonel Mackenzie notes that:

There are two kinds of temples among the Jains; one covered with a roof, and called Basti; and the other an open area surrounded by a wall, and called Bettu, which signifies a hill...In the Bastis are here worshipped the images of twenty-four persons, who have obtained Sidd'hi, or become gods. These images are all naked, and exactly of the same form; but they are called by different names, according to the person, whom they are meant to represent. These idols are in the form of a man sitting. In the temples called Bettu, the only image of a Sidd'ha, is that of a person called Gomata Raja, who, while on earth, was a powerful king. The images of Gomata Raja are naked, and always of a colossal size.

First, Mackenzie records the names of these Bāhubali images as Gommaṭa Rāja or King Gommaṭa and remarks on his powerful royal tenure while on earth. Here we see the kingly quality of Bāhubali come to the fore within the colonial archives. Second, due to the prominence of the monoliths within this landscape, Mackenzie understands Bāhubali

---

545 Jennifer Howes recently corrected a long misidentified Thomas Hicky painting, entitled "Colonel Mackenzie and his Pandits" (1816) as depicting Kārkaḷa rather than Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. In this painting, Mackenzie and his three Indian assistants, one of whom is reputed to have been the Jain Dēvacandra, stand together with the Kārkaḷa Bāhubali statue in the background. Mackenzie’s surveying pole at Kārkala, which was never removed, appears in the painting and still stands next to the image today. Jennifer Howes, *Illustrating India: The Early Colonial Investigations of Colin Mackenzie* (1784-1821) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 215 and 233 fn. 66.

worship as entirely separate from temple worship to the twenty-four Jinas.\textsuperscript{547} The significance of this reading should not be underestimated. Bāhubali worship is so prominent in this region that Mackenzie understood it to be its own sect. Many scholars have argued that goddess worship is the defining feature of Deccani Digambara Jainism, a feature hinted at by the role of the goddess Kūsmāṇḍinī in the Gullekāyi Ajji story.\textsuperscript{548} However, I would amend this argument to also include devotion to Bāhubali.

5. The Boppana Inscription, Narrative Accumulation, and Textual Proliferation

The importance of pilgrimage and place within the Bāhubali dotted landscape of the southern Deccan is elaborated over time as the Bāhubali and Bharata narrative cycle

\textsuperscript{547} As such, the Mackenzie Collection includes a large number of images and sketches from both of these sites including many of the Bāhubali statues. For more on Colin Mackenzie’s activities in the former Mysore State see Jennifer Howes, \textit{Illustrating India: The Early Colonial Investigations of Colin Mackenzie} (1784-1821) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) and Barry Lewis, "The Mysore Kingdom at AD 1800: Archaeological Applications of the Mysore Survey of Colin Mackenzie," in \textit{South Asian Archaeology} Volume 2, eds. Catherine Jarrige and Vincent Lefevre (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001), 557-565. Mackenzie further amassed a collection of forty-four South Indian Jain Manuscripts including Jinasēna and Cāvuṇḍarāya's \textit{Ādigurānas}, as well as several later texts that detail the installation of the Bāhubali image of Śravaṇa Belagola. For example, the Bhāratēśvara Charitra by Ratnakara Muni (Mackenzie Collection no. 11), the Gomatēśvara Pratiṣṭa Charitra by Chandraya Kāvi (Mackenzie Collection no. 16), and the Chāmundarāya Šataka (Mackenzie Collection no. 30). For a full list of Mackenzie's Jain manuscripts see the "Jain Literature," in H.H. Wilson, \textit{Mackenzie Collection} (Madras: Higginbotham & Col, 1882), 176-188. However, Wilson’s catalogue is out of date. The majority of Kannada manuscripts were sent back to India from the British Library in London. As far as I can make out, the Kannada manuscripts sent from London were initially deposited at the Government Oriental Manuscript Institute, Chennai. A portion of these manuscripts were then sent to the Oriental Research Institute in Mysore and were later moved to Kevempu Institute of Kannada Studies at the University of Mysore. Today the manuscripts at the Government Oriental Manuscript Institute are cataloged in an unpublished hand-written handlist held by the research librarians and the manuscripts at the University of Mysore have been incorporated into the library’s published catalogue.

accumulated further extra-narrative material. Central to this elaboration is a poetic inscription situated on a large stele outside the monolith’s enclosure on the right hand (Fig. 5.24). The stone is inscribed with a Kannada poem composed by a relatively well-known poet named Boppana, pen-name Sujanottama, who is celebrated in Kesiraja’s Ādipurāṇa (Fig. 5.25). The poem narrates both the story of Bāhubali within the established Ādipurāṇa narrative as well as the beginnings of a hagiography of Cāvuṇḍarāya that includes a sthalapurāṇa, or origin story, of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. I quote here an extended passage that includes these elements:

I am inspired to praise the immeasurable and beauteous Gommaṭa Jina
who is worshiped by lords of men, snakes, gods, demons, and sky-goers
and meditated upon by yogis.
He is a god of love who extinguishes the fire of meditation.
Accordingly, Bharata, his older brother, refused to speak to him
after loosing in one on one combat.
When he shot his cakra and it failed to strike, he was enveloped in shame.
Bāhubali gave away the empire of the earth.
With austerities, he went out and destroyed his enemies in the form of karma.
Who else is so honorable as the spiritually elevated Bāhubali, son of Puru?
With a joyful mind, Cakravartin Bharata,
the lord who conquered the entire world and the son of Purudēva,
was prompted to that image, an image that was five hundred and twenty-five lengths high
and resembled Bāhubalikēvali’s form as he upheld victory.
After some time, an innumerable throng of Kukkuṭasarpas, cause of fear in the world,
sprung up in that place associated with the female guardian deity near that Jina.
Indeed, that enemy of sin became known by the name Kukkuṭēśvara.
After that, it became invisible.
In that way, many people employed mantras and tantras in order to see it.
It is one is able to hear the roar of the divine dundubhi drum
and able to see the network of divine worship.
People catch a glimpse of the beautiful glittering mirror of the Jina’s toe nails
and some see the shape of their previous births and deaths.
The god’s exceedingly pure fame is celebrated on the earth.
Cāvuṇḍarāya heard about that Jina’s renowned fame from the people.
A desire was born in his mind to see it.

549 J.S. Kulli, Kesiraja’s Šabdamaniḍarpaṇa (Dharwar, Karnatak University, 1976), 17 and 23.
When the noble people became aware of his impending departure, they said, “That city is distant and inaccessible.”

He responded, “In light of that, I will make an image of that god.”

In this way, he caused the construction of the God Gōmaṭa.

The famous King Rācamalla, the moon of the Gaṅga family, possessed transmitted knowledge, pure vision, power, good conduct, charity, and joy.

Did not Cāvuṇḍarāya alias Gommaṭa, an was equal to Manu, possess both power of the king and of one famous in the world?

In this way, with great effort, he erected this god.550

In the very first line, the poem refers to the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa as Gommaṭa-Jina. The derivation of this name is made clear later in a later passage that Gommaṭa is an alias of Cāvuṇḍarāya. This monolith is not just a generic image of Bāhubali, but is specified through association with its commissioning patron. The centrality of the specifically local form of Bāhubali as Gommaṭa-Jina at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa—also simply called Gommaṭa or Gommaṭēśvara—gives rise to the widespread adoption of this name for any Bāhubali image at any locale, even those outside the Deccan.

Boppaṇa also calls the monolith Kukkuṭēśvara, a name tied to the image’s sthalapurāṇa, a sthalapurāṇa that expands the content of the Ādipurāṇa narrative through the addition of a scene involving Bharata. Boppaṇa familiarly recounts how after defeating Bharata in one-on-one combat, Bāhubali realizes the fruitlessness of worldly attachment and withdraws to the forest where he performs penance to combat karma, described here through the militant metaphor of “enemy karma.” But then Boppaṇa goes off the established script of the Ādipurāṇas that precede it. He describes how Bharata erects a monumental statue of his brother at Podanapura, the site of their former battle. Over time, the statue becomes invisible through a concentration of kukkuṭasarpas, a

550 EC Vol. 2, no. 85, 462 (English), 90 (Kannada), and 67 (transliteration).
mythical half-rooster half-snake beast, that is the vehicle of the Goddess Padmāvati (Fig. 5.26). The image is only occasionally visible with the employment of mantras and tantras. Through its connection with this composite animal, the statue comes to bear the title Kukkuṭēśvara, Lord of the Kukkuṭa. Just as the Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa became known as “the new Podanapura” (abhinavapodanapura) after the construction of the Bāhubali monolith so too did the site come to be known as “the southern Kukkuṭēśvara” (dakṣiṇa kukkuṭēśvara), a name that maintains the narrative fiction established by the Boppana inscription that the Bāhubali monolith was modeled on an inaccessible real-world statue built by Bharata (the uttarakukkuṭēśvara). The titles Gommaṭa and Kukkuṭēśvara highlight the ways in which this statue and its patron began to collectively constitute the localization of the Ādipurāṇa narrative.\textsuperscript{551}

Boppana also significantly supplies a reading of the figure of Bāhubali. He says:

> “Though (as) Cupid he had formerly the greatness of the empire of desire in him, and though the discus weapon, resembling the sun, discharged from the hand of Bharata, desired along the with the empire of the earth, his mighty arm, Bāhubali forsook them (the two empires) and took initiation for the sake of the happiness of the empire of final emancipation.”\textsuperscript{552}

Here emancipation is being troped as a form of imperium that displaces the empires of desire and mundane sovereignty. This corroborates the idea that in forsaking mundane kingship and the image of a desirous king that I explore in my third chapter, Bāhubali achieves a different and more powerful form of kingship that is Jain liberation. Bāhubali’s subversive quality as a self-sovereign that I unpack in this chapter, was also
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legible to Boppaṇa, a twelfth-century reader.

The *kukkuṭasarpa* obscured monolith also plays a role in the hagiographical account that Boppaṇa develops around Čāvuṇḍarāya. He comes to hear of the image’s magical qualities and desires to see it for himself. His preceptors dissuade him by pointing out that the image is far away and impenetrable. In the absence of the original, Čāvuṇḍarāya mimics Bharata’s devotional deed, commissioning a replica of the Bāhubali colossus to be built at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. Čāvuṇḍarāya was not alone in building the landscape in the Ādipurāṇa’s image; as noted earlier, strikingly similar monoliths were constructed across the Deccan as late as the twentieth century. Čāvuṇḍarāya and his story too becomes deeply conceptually bound to the story Bāhubali and his image. For example, the Ajīla king Timmarāja who built the Bāhubali monolith at Vēṇūr in 1604 C.E. traces his family lineage back to Čāvuṇḍarāya, describing himself as an “ornament of the family of Camuṇḍa.” The Woḍeyars, perhaps unsurprisingly given their considerable donative activity at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, also claim descent from Čāvuṇḍarāya’s lineage (śrīcāvuṇḍarājavamśastharāda).

In a feedback loop between literary and material cultures, these statues gave rise to new genres that focused exclusively on the narrative of Bāhubali or even on specific statues of Bāhubali largely building off the expanded narrative found in the Boppaṇa inscription. The majority of these texts appear in the late medieval to early modern period as an attempt to make sense of the continued practice of building Bāhubali

---
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monoliths on the landscape of the Deccan. For example, in the sixteenth century we have Doddaiya’s *Bhujabali Śataka* and Pañcabāṇa's *Bhujabali Carite*, in seventeenth century Cidananda Kavi’s *Munivamśābhyudaya*, Candrama Kavi’s *Kārkaḷada Gomāṭēśvara Carite*, and Padmanabha’s *Vēṇūru Bhujabali Carite*, in the eighteenth century there is Anantakavi’s *Gommaṭēśvara Carite*, and in the nineteenth century Dévacandra’s *Rājāvali Kathe*. These texts collectively attempt to give an account of the Ādipurāṇa narrative, the statues of a particular place, and the origins of the monolithic practice established by Cāvuṇḍarāya. In so doing, the Ādipurāṇa tradition accumulates narrative, undiscerningly absorbing local lore and historical fact that gives rise to a textual proliferation of localized accounts that make sense of this devotional landscape.

5. Conclusion

Jinasēna wrote the first Sanskrit kāvya Ādipurāṇaṃ. Pampa wrote the first Kannada campū kāvya Ādipurāṇaṃ. Cāvuṇḍarāya wrote the first Kannada prose Ādipurāṇa within the context of his larger mahāpurāṇa project. Within a period of two centuries spanning the ninth and tenth centuries, this narrative gave rise to some of the most novel and transformative literary developments in the region. The afterlives of these texts differ as dramatically as their genres and styles. Jinasēna’s Ādipurāṇa emerged out of the robust Jain Sanskrit literary milieu of Amōghavarṣa’s court, a court in which Jains quite suddenly and only momentarily embraced Sanskrit for their literary and intellectual production. Within a century, Jain literati largely moved on to Kannada as their language of choice as exemplified by Pampa’s Ādipurāṇaṃ, the first extant piece of Kannada literature. As the ādikavi and the Ādipurāṇa (in all the literalness that the prefix ādi or “first” suggests), Pampa’s campū kāvya style became the de rigueur literary style in the
centuries that followed—never completely going out of fashion and enjoying a neoclassical revival in the Woḍeyar period. The literary position, affect, and reception of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam is nowhere as clear. As the first piece of extant Kannada prose literature, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam is just as innovative as its predecessors. However, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s prose is a singular literary event. Unlike Jinasēna he did not have peers writing in a similar style. Nor did he have Pampa’s impact in influencing the genre and style of succeeding generations of writers. Indeed, the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam lingers as a literary historical footnote to the history of Kannada literature—somehow important, but ineffable.

In this chapter I offered two readings of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text. I suggested that we can read the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ as a commonplace book or a compendium of desirable literary knowledge. Alternatively, I interpreted the text as an aide-memoire for an audience of pious Jains familiar with the narrative, but who just needed a prompt to remember what they already knew and to feel the way they already felt. If it is impossible, as I suggest, to firmly pin down the literary work of the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇaṃ—its affect, its audience, its usage— we can identify in the text an emphasis on certain narrative content over others. For example, the Bharata and Bāhubali cycle comes to the fore in Cāvuṇḍarāya’s pared down prose version. I interpret Cāvuṇḍarāya’s emphasis on their fraternal interaction as attuning his readers to the centrality of these characters in his interpenetrating textual and visual worlds. Indeed, the singularity of Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text is perhaps only matched by his unique act of commissioning the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa. The two are interrelated: Cāvuṇḍarāya literally builds the Ādipurāṇa narrative onto the landscape of the Deccan, according a density and
heightened grandeur to a single moment of his narrative. The relationship between the textual narrative and the statue extends even further with the statue locating its viewer in the gaze of Bharata—and, by extension Cāvuṇḍarāya—such that an ideal king becomes a Jain devotee, and, more specifically, a devotee to Bāhubali. Inversely, Bāhubali becomes an ideal self-sovereign whose embodied power is divorced from kingship itself.

The kings of the medieval and early modern Deccan took Cāvuṇḍarāya’s hint, worshipping Bāhubali through the mahāmastakābhiṣēka ceremony and building monoliths across the southern Deccan modeled on Cāvuṇḍarāya’s original at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. To be a king in that time and place meant being a devotee to Bāhubali. Succeeding authors sought to make sense of the Ādipurāṇa inspired landscape around them. In so doing, they expanded the scope and content of the narrative itself. In these later renditions, Cāvuṇḍarāya is made a character and his Bāhubali statue is incorporated through an emendation to the original textual version: Cāvuṇḍarāya mimics Bharata’s original devotional act of building a monolith to commemorate his brother. As a consequence, Śravaṇa Belgoḷa became a site enfolded into an expanded mythology based on the Ādipurāṇa. Collectively, this archive of materials—starting with the Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s monolithic statue, the Boppaṇa inscription, the construction of the later monoliths, and the expanded versions of the narrative,—that span various artistic mediums tell the story of the development of a devotional cult centered around Bāhubali.

This chapter began with the Western Gaṅga general Cāvuṇḍarāya as an historical figure moving through inscriptional and textual sources. The chapter ends with Cāvuṇḍarāya as a character incorporated into the expanded Ādi narrative that commenced with the Boppaṇa Inscription and further accumulated content in later textual
renditions including the Kārkaṇḍa Gomaṭēśvara Carite and Vēṇūru Bhujabali Carite. In tracking Cāvuṇḍarāya’s many guises as a military general, lay Jain devotee, literary patron, king, author, and, most notably, commissioner of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, we trace the emergence of a geographically bounded devotional cult to Bāhubali. As compelling a figure as Cāvuṇḍarāya is, the Bāhubali cult is not a product of his sole genius. Rather this chapter argues that Cāvuṇḍarāya’s purāṇa and his Bāhubali statue are a further articulation of a Jain preoccupation with the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa that culminates (at least in this dissertation) with the emergence of the Bāhubali cult. Like Jinasēna and Pampa before him, Cāvuṇḍarāya’s bounded devotional acts in text and in stone turn to the Ādipurāṇa and its characters to theorize the relationship between Jainism and kingship and the constitution of an ideal ruler. In so doing, Cāvuṇḍarāya separates kingship and sovereignty, formerly bound together in the figure of the renunciate Jain king. Through Cāvuṇḍarāya’s text and statue, Bharata, the Jain devotee, becomes the ideal king and Bāhubali, the renunciate king, becomes the ideal self-sovereign.
CONCLUSION

1. Introduction

This dissertation captures two distinct perspectives on the relationship between Jainism and sovereignty: the figure of the king and the genre of the Ādipurāṇa. The first two chapters focus on Jainism and Jain literati vis-à-vis the court. Reading along the archival grain, the first chapter, “An Archive of Aspirations: Jain Literati and the Making of a Cosmopolitan Court,” views Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amōghavarṣa (814-878 c.e.) and his court as Jain Sanskrit literati aspired for it to be seen; this was a Jain court with a renunciate Jain king at its apex. I argue that this court was a signal moment when Jains recognized Sanskrit as a tool for political expression legible outside the boundaries of the Jain community, a tool that could then be marshaled to capture nodal points of power such as the king himself. It was also a moment in which the literary culture of the medieval Deccan would shift profoundly from Sanskrit to Kannada. Following Śrīvijaya’s Kannada Kavirājamārgam in which Amōghavarṣa appears as an authorizing voice, I suggest that the Jain preoccupation with this king led Jain literati to abandon Sanskrit in favor of the Sanskritized Kannada imagined in this text. This linguistic shift would shape the parameters of the Ādipurāṇa tradition that follows. The second chapter, “Connective Tissue: Literati, Texts, Polities,” considers the dialectical relationship between state form and literary production. By tracking the movements and complex social positions of three Jain poets—Jinasēna, Pampa, and Cāvuṇḍarāya—, I propose an alternative vision of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire as bound together by a shared literary ethos. The literary developments of Amōghavarṣa’s court provided the cultural cohesion for the political nexus of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Eastern Cāḷukyas, and Western Gaṅgas. To think
empire from this perspective reveals the larger cultural force that Jainism had accrued in this period, a force that exceeded a purely theological domain. This chapter also highlights the central role of this religious community in the cultivation of literary languages and elite forms of literature.

Chapters three, four, and five change perspectives to consider the ways in which such Jain investments in the king and the court were theorized, modeled, and continually revised in the Ādipurāṇa genre. The third chapter, “The Kingdom is a Poisonous Flower: Kingship as a Path to Renunciation,” focuses on Jinasēna’s Sanskrit rendition of the Ādipurāṇa (c. 860 c.e.). I read Jinasēna’s text as intervening into preexistent debates over the proper practice of royal renunciation. The text understands kingship as a heightened sensorium of worldly experience that paradoxically leads to renunciation; one cannot truly renounce without knowing what one is renouncing. Jinasēna proposes a specifically Jain model of kingship as a privileged path to renunciation and, as such, a vision in which ideal kings renounce their kingdoms. The fourth chapter, “Transmigratory Love Stories in Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam: Caught in a Bad Romance?” considers the classic trope of a romantically entangled king redeployed in the Jain context of Pampa’s Ādipurāṇam (941 c.e.). This aspect of the king’s persona reveals a distinctly Jain ontology of emotion: emotion is a material substance that sticks to the soul much like karma. Pampa’s version of the narrative poses a connection between erotic sexual love and religious devotional love. We come to see that love itself has liberatory potential. The fifth chapter, “Acts of Translation: The Ādipurāṇa in Text, Image, and Inscription,” continues with the theme of devotion—its proper object and practice—in the world of the Western Gaṅga General Cāvuṇḍarāya. I read the Ādi section of his Cāvuṇḍarāya Purāṇam (978 c.e) as disclosing
a particular investment in the figure of Bāhubali that is reduplicated in Cāvuṇḍarāya’s construction of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa (981 c.e.). In viewing this statue, I argue, Cāvuṇḍarāya imagines an ideal king as a devotee of the self-sovereign Bāhubali. Starting with the inscriptional poet Boppaṇa, Cāvuṇḍarāya inspired a new genre that bound together his personal biography, the origins myths of the Bāhubali statue at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, and the Ādipurāṇa narrative. His Bāhubali statue also gave rise to imitations in the form of subsequent Bāhubali monoliths constructed in the succeeding centuries in the western Deccan. This landscape was quite literally constructed in the image of the Ādipurāṇa narrative, which gave rise to a distinctly Jain regional devotional culture. Across these later three chapters, the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa remains stable since, after all, the biography of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha is eternal and unchanging. However, the form, style, language, affective tenor, narrative focus, and character development is unique to each poet as they theorize the relationship between Jainism and kingship. In reading various iterations of the Ādipurāṇa in different languages and genres, the image of an ideal Jain king changes and evolves alongside shifting notions of bodily, worldly, and spiritual sovereignty. What is common to them all is the narrative of the Ādipurāṇa as a site of improvisation and theorization.

While this dissertation culminates with Cāvuṇḍarāya’s artistic and literary activities in chapter five, the story of Jainism and its investment in kingship and sovereignty does not end there. Rather, Cāvuṇḍarāya acts as a pivot out of the realm of art, literature, and cultural production and into the realm of Jain institutional cultivation designed to directly challenge the court. As we have seen, in 981 c.e., Cāvuṇḍarāya consecrated his Bāhubali monolith atop Vindhyagiri at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. Simultaneous to
this event, he also consecrated his guru Nēmicandra—author of the *Dravyasamgraha* (The Compendium on Substances) and *Gommaṭasāra* (The Essence for Gommaṭa)—as *bhaṭṭāraka* at the newly founded *maṭha* at the base of Vindhyagiri. To conclude this dissertation on Jainism, kingship, and sovereignty, I want to think about the afterlife of these concepts as Jains increasingly turned to the *maṭha* as the site of true mundane power. The following sections will explore the emergence of the Jain *maṭha* system within the rapidly changing monastic landscape of the eighth- to tenth-century Deccan. Jain *maṭhas* were transformed into regional power centers through their affiliations with regionally based monastic and caste communities and the absorption of local devotional cults to Jain goddesses as well as to Bāhubali. As sites of locally based religious authority, these *maṭhas* headed by *bhaṭṭārakas* became appealing objects of patronage for regional and imperial polities; in turn, *maṭhas* became places where the fruits of patronage could be centralized and administered. And, more often than not, patronage of a *maṭha* (or the Jain community more broadly) was coupled with royal devotion to the *bhaṭṭārakas*. The proximity and intimacy between kings and *bhaṭṭārakas* led Jains to coopt—much like in Jinasēna’s *Ādipurāṇa*—imperial metaphors and the idiom of kingship to describe the power and sovereignty of the *bhaṭṭāraka* ensconced in his *maṭha*. Here again, we see a Jain take on political theology playing out in an institutional space. The relationship between courts and *maṭhas* demonstrates this religion’s adaptability to emergent forms of political power and the decisive ways that political concepts animate religious imaginaries.

2. The Emergence of the Jain *Bhaṭṭāraka* and the *Maṭha*

Cāvuṇḍarāya’s consecration of Nēmicandra as the *bhaṭṭāraka* at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa
brought about one of the most fundamental structural changes to Jain religious life in the early medieval Kannada-speaking areas of the Deccan. This consecration marked the emergence of the *maṭha*, a word commonly translated as “monastery.” By the medieval period, an extensive network of these *maṭhas* covered the landscape of the western Deccan. In the contemporary Deccan only thirteen *maṭhas* remain (Fig. C.1). In the state of Karnataka, there are seven extant medieval *maṭhas* at Huṃca (Fig. C.2), Kārkaḷa (Fig. C.3), Narasimharājapura (Fig. C.4), Mūḍbidrī/Kṣēmavēṇu (Fig. C.5), Swāḍī/ Sonda (Fig. C.6), Śravaṇa Belgoḷa (Fig. C.7), and Varāṅga (Fig. C.8). In addition, *maṭhas* at Amminabhavi (2005), Kanakagiri/Maleyūr (1997), Kambadahaḷḷi (1998), and Lakkavaḷḷi (2004) have been recently revived due to the efforts of the head of the Śravaṇa Belgoḷa Maṭha. In Maharashtra, there are two remaining medieval *maṭhas* at Kolhāpur and Nāndaṇī. There are two further *maṭhas* in Tamil Nadu: Jina Kāņci at Melsithamur and Arhantagiri near Tirumalai, the latter of which was revived in February 1998 by Carukīrti Bhaṭṭāraka of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. However, it is clear from the inscriptional record—which makes reference to no longer extant *maṭhas*—that there were additional Jain *maṭhas* at such sites as Bīḷagi/Śvētapura, Haḍuvaḷḷi/Sangītapura, and Maḷkhēḍ/Maḷayādri in Karnataka as well as in Lātūr and Kāraṇja in Maharashtra. We also find references to an important Jain *maṭha* at Penukoṇḍa in Andhra Pradesh that is no longer extant. The number of Digambara Jain *maṭhas* in the medieval Deccan far exceeded the current thirteen, perhaps numbering as high as sixty-five.

Who then was this Digambara bhaṭṭāraka? The term bhaṭṭāraka itself translates to “a great lord” or “venerable person” and was one of many titles incorporated into the vocabulary of kingship in the medieval period. It often occurred within a long list of
imperial titles in royal *praśastis*: “Svasti samasta-bhuvanāśrayaṁ śrī-prthvī-vallabhaṁ mahārājādirāja paramēśvaraṁ parama-bhaṭṭāraka.” The cooptation of the term *bhaṭṭāraka* within the Digambara Jain context came to name, according to Paul Dundas, “the head of any group of naked monks who lived permanently in one of the monasteries (*maṭha*) which had begun to be built near temple complexes from about the fifth century C.E.” Indeed, the population of *maṭhas* by an emergent class of residential monks produced two distinct categories of ascetics: those who resided and wandered in forests (*vanavāsi*) and those who dwelt in *maṭhas* (*maṭhavāsi*). These communities of increasingly settled monks were headed by the *bhaṭṭāraka*. While the role of the *bhaṭṭāraka* within the emergent institution of the *maṭha* was manifold, the inscriptive records suggest that one of their central roles was to facilitate and centralize royal patronage—patronage that was exceedingly lucrative, but was at risk of being diffusely distributed to a complex and competing system of Jain monastic lineages such as the Pustaka Gaccha of the Deśiya Gaṇa of the Mūla Saṅgha or the Aruṅgala Anvaya of the Draviḍa Saṅgha. Led by *bhaṭṭārakas*, the institution of the *maṭha* became a site in which the fruits generated by patronage could be centralized, collectively administered, and parlayed into further patronage. Beyond these monastic and material aspects, *maṭhas* guided by increasingly powerful *bhaṭṭārakas* liaised with polities, provided housing for monks and pilgrims, cultivated extensive manuscript libraries, patronized literature and art, and provided for important ritual and educational aspects of Jain lay life. In short, Jain *maṭhas* headed by *bhaṭṭārakas* became centers of regional power that rivaled the institutional role of regional courts.

The competition between the ever-proliferating Digambara monastic orders is
most visible in the contestation and application for patronage expressed in the epigraphical record. In this period, we see the development of close relationships between specific monastic orders and powerful local village headmen, mercantile organizations, and, most importantly, the regional and imperial polities of the western Deccan. For example, the ninth-century Śāntara dynasty of Huṃca in Shimoga District cultivated a close connection with the Nandi Gaṇa of the Aruṅgala Anvaya, a connection expressed through the formal twinning of the Śāntara and Aruṅgala Anvaya genealogies within the inscriptive record. More often than not, the object of this increasing political largesse and panegyrics was the figure of the Jain bhaṭṭāraka. To continue with the Śāntara example, consider this inscription from the Paṅca Basaḍi at Huṃca,

Thus, on account of the abode of fame and renown Chaṭṭala-Dēvi and Nanni-Śāntara, being Oḍeya-Dēva’s lay disciples, pronouncing the name of Śrīvijaya-bhaṭṭāraka, head of the Nandi-gaṇa of the Aruṅgalānvaya of the Nidumbaṅre-tīrtha of the Tiya-guḍi, at an auspicious moment, his disciple Śreyāmsa-paṇḍita laid the foundation stone, in the principle spot, of the Paṅcha-basadi known as Urvvī-tilakam (an ornament to the earth).

Here we see Nanni Śāntara, the eleventh-century leader of the dynasty, depicted not just as a Jain devotee, but also specifically as a devotee to Śrīvijaya Bhaṭṭāraka, head of the Nandi Gaṇa.

3. Maṭhas as Regional Power Centers

The bhaṭṭārakas housed in their maṭhas further enhanced their regional connections to local communities through affiliation with specific monastic lineages, caste groups, and association with certain powerful divine subsidiary deities within the tradition. Their regional embeddedness is what made these bhaṭṭārakas and maṭhas so powerful. In the Deccan today, the institutional and religious life of the remaining Jain maṭhas continues to be run by bhaṭṭārakas who are drawn from a semi-ordained class of advanced
layman—similar to kṣullakas or ailakas. Crucially, and unlike fully initiated Jain monks, this semi-ordained class can own property (on behalf of the saṅgha) and can interact with money. It is quite clear that the increasingly lay character of the modern bhaṭṭāraka is a development born from the persistent critiques of the seventeenth-century Digambara Terāpanth reformist movement, whose wholesale rejection of the bhaṭṭāraka led to the disbanding of the maṭha system in North India. Prior to the transformations induced by this critique, the Jain bhaṭṭārakas of the medieval Deccan were fully ordained monks who maintained strong connections to their monastic lineages and accepted their own lay and monastic disciples. As Peter Flügel notes, the medieval bhaṭṭārakas observed “a relaxed set of ascetic vows, which entitle[d] them to wear clothes, to administer monastic property in the name of the saṅgha (private property is not permitted), to live permanently in one or more monastery, to use vehicles, to act as heads of the Jain communities and later of Jain castes, etc.” From inscriptions, we know that they engaged in financial transactions on behalf of their maṭhas. For example, an inscription from Vēṇūr dated 1537 C.E., records a purchase of land by Bhaṭṭāraka Lalitakīrti from the Ajila Chief, which he then donated to the local Jain basaḍi for the feeding of ascetics. In the medieval period, bhaṭṭārakas were monks whereas today they are semi-ordained laymen. The association of contemporary maṭhas with specific monastic lineages recalls the former monastic characters of the medieval bhaṭṭāraka.

Much in the same way that monastic lineages kept paṭṭavāḷis to record lines of monastic descent, so too did bhaṭṭārakas understand themselves as part of uninterrupted lineages of maṭha authority. For example, the bhaṭṭāraka lineage at the Swādī Maṭha traces its origins back to the famous Jain grammarian and monk Bhaṭṭākaḷaṇka, author of
the Kannada Śabdānuśāna (1604 C.E.) and Jinasēna, the author of the first Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa and the subject of chapter three, is associated with bhaṭṭāraka traditions at the no longer extant maṭha in Maḷkhēḍ, Karnataka and the current maṭha in Nāndaṇī, Maharashtra. In this way, such Jain poets and grammarians famous in the Deccani courts were relocated and claimed by maṭhas. Bhaṭṭārakas at each of these maṭhas adopted hereditary titles that were passed down to monks within the same monastic lineage (Bhānukīrti at Kambadahaḷḷi, Bhaṭṭākaḷaṇka at Swādī, Bhuvanakīrti at Kanakagiri, Cārukīrti at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, Cārukīrti at Mūḍbidrī, Dēvēndrakīrti at Huṃca, Jinasēna at Nāndaṇī, Lakṣmīsēna at Kolhāpur, Lalitakīrti at Kārkaḷa, Viṣalakīrti at Lātūr, Vṛṣabhasēna at Lakkavaḷḷi, and Lakṣmīsēna at Narasiṃharājapura). In sum, specific maṭhas began to be associated with particular lineages that reflected the bhaṭṭārakas’ monastic affiliation. The maṭhas at Kolhāpur, Nāndaṇī, and Narasiṃharājapura belong to the Sēna Gaṇa, the maṭhas at Kambadahaḷḷi, Kanakagiri, Kārkaḷa, Mūḍbidrī, and Śravaṇa Belgoḷa are associated with the Deśi Gaṇa, and the maṭha at Huṃca is affiliated with the Balātkāra Gaṇa. In addition, these maṭhas began to establish their own subsidiary or feudatory lines that expanded the influence and reach of their monastic communities. For example, the bhaṭṭāraka and maṭha at Haḍuvalḷi (Saṅgītapura) were established in the twelfth century as a subsidiary line of the maṭha at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. The Mūḍbidrī Maṭha was established as yet another offshoot of the Śravaṇa Belgoḷa Maṭha in the fourteenth century when Śravaṇa Belgoḷa went into a period of decline. These two subsidiary maṭhas share Śravaṇa Belgoḷa’s hereditary bhaṭṭāraka title of Cārukīrti as well as the same monastic affiliation with the Deśi Gaṇa. Much like regional polities, bhaṭṭārakas attempted to establish and expand their territorial control.
Beyond monastic affiliation, the *mathas* of the medieval western Deccan also became identified with specific Jain castes; in fact, many of the Jain castes were established by *bhaṭṭārakas* themselves. Beyond the regional *mathas*, Jain caste groups also tend to congregate around specific temples within a village or town. Michael Carrithers makes note of the practice of naming a temple after a particular caste group, a practice that we still see at the *matha* at Huṃca, which is connected to the Bogāra caste and also has a temple that bears the name Bogāra Basaḍi. While received depictions of Jainism often depict it as a religion standing outside of and as critical of the traditional varṇāśrama system, the development of caste in Deccani Jainism can be glimpsed as early as Jinasēna’s ninth-century Sanskrit Ādipurāṇa. It narrates Ādinātha’s establishment of the *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya*, and *śūdra* castes as well as his eldest son Bharata’s establishment of the *brāhmin* caste (as a sign of moral excellence rather than birthright).

The caste composition of the Digambara Jain community in the Deccan is comprised of seven main groups: Bogāra/Kasars (copper vessel dealers/bangle sellers), Caturthas (agriculturalists), Kṣatriyas, Pañcamas (traders), Saitavālas (tailors, cloth merchants), Upadhyes (priests), and Vaiśyas. The association between *bhaṭṭārakas* and caste groups in some areas is so strong that John Cort, Michael Carrithers, and Sabine Scholz have all gone so far as to call the Digambara *bhaṭṭārakas* “regional caste gurus.” Tensions between castes are most apparent when multiple caste communities and their *mathas* are in close proximity. For example, the *mathas* at Kolhāpur and Nāndaṇī—affiliated with the Pañcama and Caturtha castes respectively—are a mere twenty-five miles apart, but these communities have little contact with each others’ *mathas* or *bhaṭṭārakas* and observe strict caste endogamy. The policing of such strict boundaries only began to be
relaxed in the early twentieth-century when, as Sabine Scholz reports, there was a movement in the Kolhāpur region to “… amalgamate the Chaturth and Pancham subsets of the Jains”; a declaration had been signed by more than ‘100 leading gentlemen expressing approval of the movement […]’ (Latthe 1914:154). The leader of this movement himself declares, ‘As a result of this I married my niece Shermatibai to a Chaturth boy last week. I am a Pancham Jain and this is the first marriage between the two sects’ (1914;153).” In my observation, this movement largely failed.

Beyond creating communal ties through monastic and caste affiliations, several maṭhas in the Deccan were transformed into sacred centers through their association with powerful subsidiary deities within the tradition. The recourse to such figures derives from the problem posed by the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras. Tīrthaṅkaras are perfected, liberated beings who retain the capacity to act in the world, but whose cultivated dispassion prevents them from doing so. Jain devotees, in other words, could not and cannot interact with the fundamental figures of their faith. To compensate for this deficit, they developed and maintained transactional relationships with the pairs of yakṣis and yakṣas, or guardian deities, who were connected with each of the Tīrthaṅkaras. In the medieval Kannada speaking regions, the yakṣis Jvālāmālini, Kuṣmāṇḍini, and Padmāvati became particularly popular. And, indeed, several scholars have argued that the emergence of these Jain goddess cults was instrumental to the rise of Jainism in the region. These goddesses were subsumed into the maṭha system through the association of their kṣētras, or sacred centers, with specific maṭhas. The kṣētra of Jvālāmālini is at the Narasimharājapura Maṭha, Kuṣmāṇḍini is associated both with the Swāḍī and Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa Maṭhas, and the kṣētra of Kuṣmāṇḍini is at the Huṃca Maṭha. Through the
incorporation of devotional goddess cults, these *maṭhas* became three of the most important Jain pilgrimage sites in the region.

As I argued previously, if South India Jainism is distinctive for its emphasis on goddess worship, then it is also equally notable for its devotional tradition centered around Bāhubali, or Gommaṭa, the son of the first Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha. The Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa inspired a series of replicas across the lower Deccan erected on hilltops at Gommaṭagiri, Kārkaḷa, Vēṇūr, and so on. While several *maṭhas* share sites with Bāhubali monoliths, *bhaṭṭārakas* were also instrumental in facilitating the building of monoliths at other sites. For example, the Bāhubali statue at Vēṇūr was constructed at the behest of Cārukīrti Bhaṭṭāraka of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. In the case of Kārkaḷa and Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, these monumental sized Bāhubālis grace hilltops with *maṭhas* buildings skirting their base—transforming the site into one of both institutional and devotional authority. Through the assimilation and cultivation of goddess traditions and the cult of Bāhubali, *bhaṭṭarākas* converted their *maṭhas* into regional sacred centers within the devotional landscape of Digambara Jainism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maṭha</th>
<th>Bhaṭṭāraka</th>
<th>Gaṇa</th>
<th>Gaccha/ Anvaya</th>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Kṣētra</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amminabhavi</td>
<td>Dharmasēna</td>
<td>Deśi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huṃca</td>
<td>Devendrakīrti</td>
<td>Balātēka</td>
<td>Sarasvati/ Kunda-kunda</td>
<td>Bogāra</td>
<td>Padmāvati</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambadahāḷi</td>
<td>Bhānukīrti</td>
<td>Deśi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanakagīri</td>
<td>Bhuvaṇakīrti</td>
<td>Deśi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārakaḷa</td>
<td>Lalitakīrti</td>
<td>Deśi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kṣatriya</td>
<td>Bāhubali</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāraṇḍa</td>
<td>Dēvendrakīrti</td>
<td>Balātēka</td>
<td>Sarasvati/ Kunda-kunda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohāpur</td>
<td>Lakṣmīsēna</td>
<td>Sēna</td>
<td>Puṣkara</td>
<td>Pañcama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakkavāḷi</td>
<td>Vṛṣabhasēna</td>
<td>Deśi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lātūr</td>
<td>Viśalakīrti</td>
<td>Saitavāla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāndaṇī</td>
<td>Jinasēna</td>
<td>Sēna</td>
<td>Puṣkara</td>
<td>Caturthā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasiṃha- rājapura</td>
<td>Lakṣmīsēna</td>
<td>Sēna</td>
<td>Puṣkara</td>
<td>Jvālāmalini</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malkhēḍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogāra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūḍbidrī</td>
<td>Cārukīrti</td>
<td>Deśi</td>
<td>Pustaka/ Kunda-kunda</td>
<td>Upadhyay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. “Sovereigns whose Feet were Worshipped by Kings”: Imperial Metaphors and the Idiom of Kingship

The incorporation of devotional elements of Jain practice into the culture of the
matya also extended and extends to the bhattarakas themselves. The heading of this
section, "Sovereigns whose feet were worshipped by kings," is a description of Cārukṛti
Bhaṭṭāraka drawn from an inscription dated 1398 C.E. at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. The
inscription goes on to specify that “worshippers of the feet of that Pāṇḍita were the kings
of that region, distinguished for virtue, wisdom, character, and liberal gifts...” Indeed, the
rich body of inscriptions from this region attests to the religio-political networks that
were forged between bhattarakas and local polities that were, more often than not,
expressed through devotion. On the one hand, bhattarakas sought out chieftains and
kings as avenues of patronage that led to the donation of land and tax revenue, extensive
temple building and renovation projects, and the possibility of the public conversion of
the king most potently expressed through ritual death by sallēkhanā. On the other hand,
kings cultivated relationships with bhattarakas as a way to capitalize on their
institutional, ritual, and regional importance for the Digambara Jain communities of the
Deccan. These mutually advantageous relationships were unevenly depicted through the
persistent image of a bhattaraka with his feet illuminated by the glittering crowns of
kings: “all the feudatories prostrate before him, the ruler of Belgoḷa which is attached to
the Kalbappu hill...” Here we find that to access a regional Jain network of power and
authority necessitated participating in a devotional culture at whose center sat the
As kings incorporated and elevated bhaṭṭāraka into their circle of advisers (as rājagurus or as a “head-jewel of the royal favour”), bhaṭṭārakas themselves began to incorporate the idiom of kingship into their own discursive representation. For example, in this inscription dated to the Hoysaḷa period:

Be it well. Of the Śrī-mūla-saṅgha, Dēśi-gaṇa, Pustaka-gachcha, Kuṇḍakundānvaya, and Ingulēśvara circle, a bee intoxicated from the lotus feet of Gummaṭa-Jinēśvara, the lord of the auspicious Belguḷa-pura, promoter of the religious merit of the time, was, Dharmāchārya, whose titles were as follows:—nourishing the groups of lotuses of the learned, at the same time drove away the darkness from the minds of evil-speakers proud as the tortoise that bears up the earth, upholding the character of a Digambara shining ornament, he ever protected the ruddy goose the Bhavyas (or Jains),—thus was the sun Pandita-deva ever distinguished with the rays his gentle speech.

Be it well. The auspicious Achārya of the circle of the royal rājagurus, the great lord of powerful orators, a Brahma of royal speakers, emperor of all the learned, preserver of the life of Ballāla-rāya,—distinguished with these and many other titles, was Śrīmach-Chārukīrtti-Paṇḍita-dēva...

This inscription demonstrates the strategic forms of discursive representation that developed around medieval bhaṭṭārakas. Here, Cārukīrti is carefully and meticulously situated within his monastic lineage (Mūla Saṅgha, Dēśi Gaṇa, Pustaka Gaccha, Kuṇḍakunda Anvaya, and Ingulēśvara Gaṇa). The inscription then regionally connects him to the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa. Finally, Cārukīrti is described as the teacher (ācārya) of the circle of spiritual advisers to the king (rājaguru) and as a king himself, albeit one whose dominion consisted of powerful orators, royal speakers, and the learned. I argue that this final move—namely, the adoption of the idiom of kingship as an imperial metaphor of Jain power—was part of a larger process of self-fashioning in which bhaṭṭārakas and their respective maṭhas were positioned as rivals of medieval courts through the adoption of the language of imperium and hierarchal authority.
Starting with inscriptions of the twelfth century, Jain bhaṭṭārakas began to bear the title *mahāmaṇḍalācārya*. The compound that makes up this title parses as “the teacher of the great chief of the province” or “the teacher who is a great chief of the province”; in the Jain context, it likely resonated with both meanings. What makes this title significant is the way in which the nested system of hierarchal authority of medieval South Asian kingship—*mahāsāmanta, mahāmaṇḍalēśvara, mahārāja*, and so on—became the metaphorical logic through which to figure the power and authority of a Jain bhaṭṭāraka, which we see at work in this Hoysaḷa inscription dated 1196 C.E.:

Free of all enemies by the blows of the end of the dreadful club in his hands, and fixed in the centre of the earth surrounded by the moat of the four oceans, adorned with the lotus feet of the southern Kukkuṭēśvara lord Jina, and shining with the residence of Kamaṭha Pārśva Dēva and various Jinas, was the auspicious Beḷuguḷa tīrtha: whose mahāmaṇḍalāchārya was Nayakīrtti Vratīrāja.

Here, Nayakīrti, the twelfth-century bhaṭṭāraka of Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa (before the hereditary title Cārukīrti came into usage) is described at the mahāmaṇḍalācārya of that sacred site. Continuing with the Jain adoption of the idiom of kingship, Nayakīrti is also repeatedly referred to in the epigraphical record as Siddhānta Cakravarti, or the Emperor of the Jain scriptures. Again and again, we see the vocabulary of kingship and royal sovereignty redeployed within a Jain context and with a decidedly Jain object. Consider this eleventh-century Western Cāḷukya inscription:

Ah! How supreme among the ascetics is that great teacher Koṇḍakunda to whom the whole earth became subservient while he was ruling over the kingdom of austerities, fortified by the decisive victory which was his sublime character and the diplomatic code which was his severance of the karma!

In this inscription, we see the cooptation of the idiom of kingship as a metaphor for the power of Jain religious practice in achieving sovereignty. Here, the bhaṭṭāraka rules from his kingdom of austerities (*tapōrāja*) through the diplomatic code (*rājanīti*) that was his
severance of karma.

Eventually, Jain bhaṭṭārakas even come to take on the material aspects of a king ensconced in a court by, for instance, sitting on a lion-thrones (simhāsanas) in their maṭhas (Figs. C.9, C.10, and C.11). A Woḍeyar inscription from 1680 c.e in Nāgamaṅgala Taluk describes Lakšmīsēṇa Bhaṭṭāraka of the Kolhāpura Maṭha as “lord of the thrones of Dīlī, Kollāpura, Jina-Kaṅchi, and Penugoṇḍe.” Similarly, an inscription at the Vaḍgaon Basaḍi in Kolhāpur dated to 1774 c.e. describes Lakšmīsēṇa Bhaṭṭāraka as presiding over the thrones of Dili, Karavīra (Kolhāpura), Jina Kaṅchi and Penugoṇḍe.

P.B. Desai also notes that the preamble of the Maḷkhēḍ paṭṭāvaḷi begins with a praśasti to these bhaṭṭārakas that describes them as “Lords of the four lion-thrones, of Dili, Malayādri, Vijayanagara, Varāṅga, Paṭṭa-Poṁbucchca [Huṃca] that were their abodes of knowledge.” Another Woḍeyar inscription from 1830 c.e., this time from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, portrays Cāрукirtti Bhaṭṭāraka as the “occupant of the throne of the Dili, Hēmādri, Sudhā, Saṅgīta, Śvētāpura, Kshēmavēṇu and the Beḷguḷa samsthānas.” While the grouping and location of the thrones varied (often connecting maṭhas with the same monastic affiliation such as the Sēna Gaṇa and other times transgressing those community boundaries all together), the Deccani bhaṭṭārakas are envisioned as royal figures ensconced in their thrones at maṭhas across South India and even stretching across the entire subcontinent to Delhi. These Deccani inscriptions from the late medieval and early modern period belie the reformist critiques emerging out of the seventeenth-century North Indian Terāpanth movement that sought to dismantle the system of bhaṭṭārakas for their material and ritual excess. As John Cort notes “This later sect saw many of the activities of the bhaṭṭārakas as mere ‘outward pomp’ (bāhya-āḍambar) and
signs of ‘laxity’ (śithilācār).” Yet, the bhaṭṭārakas of the Deccan seemed to have only further embraced the metaphorical pomp that such throne imagery offered and persisted in their embrace of the idiom of kingship. However, this idiom of power was not confined simply to the realm of discourse, bhaṭṭārakas also adopted the attendant material and sumptuary practices of kingship. In their symbolic appropriation of royal paraphernalia and vocabulary, bhaṭṭārakas began to sit on ornately carved lion-thrones (a practice still found in contemporary maṭhas: Fig. C.12), travel by palanquin, to describe their monastic lineages as a “dynasty of crowns” (paṭṭavāḷi) and to take consecration through the “anointing of the crown” (paṭṭābhiṣēkha).

5. Alternatives Institutional Sites of Authority

The deployment of imperial metaphors and the adoption of the idiom of kingship articulated a relationship between religious and political structures that subordinated the mundane sovereignty of the court to the spiritual sovereignty of the maṭha, a location where true kingliness and spiritual sovereignty could be realized on earth. This subordination of the king and the court to the bhaṭṭāraka and maṭha was further enacted in devotional practice described above. Bhaṭṭārakas were honored as "sovereigns whose feet were worshipped by kings." While Jains continued to envision renunciation as the proper outcome of correct kingship, maṭhas with bhaṭṭārakas as the head incorporated kings—along with their ministers, army generals, and queens—into novel forms of devotional practice and new channels of patronage. Correct kingship was expanded to include the veneration of a bhaṭṭāraka. We see yet again another Jain vision of correct kingship.

This dissertation establishes a certain political world of which the Jains were key
players. We saw their activities in Amoghavarṣa’s court. To start, they were in the court, producing Sanskrit and later Kannada texts that both reflected and shaped how power could and should be expressed. The circulation of these Jain literati and their texts were the connective tissue that bound together the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire through a shared cultural, literary, and religious ethos. However, Jains and their texts did not simply embody cosmopolitan and courtly self-referentiality. Rather, through the Ādipurāṇa genre, they intervened into the form and expression of political power. Poets like Jinasēna, Pampa, and Cāvuṇḍarāya returned again and again to the Ādipurāṇa, each time making it new through novel aesthetic, linguistic, literary, and stylistic sensibilities. These poets discovered in this genre familiar and tropic kingly personas such as the renunciant king, the romantically entangled king, and the South Indian king as a bringer of rain. In grappling with these pre-established forms of kingship that circulated widely in premodern South Asia, the idiom of kingship penetrated and shaped how Jains imagined power writ large. If the king existed within the court, possessed symbolic symbols of power, had at his fingertips weapons and political techne for control, and was situated within hierarchical political relationships, then liberation and those on the path to liberation existed within a parallel structure that repurposed the language and tools of kingship for religious ends. This idiom of kingship penetrated not just literature, but, as we have seen, profoundly shaped the broader institutional culture of the medieval Jain maṭha and bhaṭṭāraka.

These literary encounters with kingship produced novel forms of sovereignty that took root in the western Deccan such as with the self-sovereign Bāhubali, but it also changed the nature of Digambara Jainism in the region. In tracking the various Jain
improvisations with the Ādipurāṇa—across language, genre, style, and artistic medium—this dissertation demonstrates a broader Jain investment in the imaginative capacity of narrative to mediate between worldly and spiritual concerns. In so doing, Jains consistently sought to conceptually figure the worldly and spiritual, the political and religious, and even the sexual and the ascetic, as deeply imbricated social worlds rather than binaristic categories of human activity. By aestheticizing sovereignty, Jain poets created an imaginative space in which intense relations to the world could be made functional for Jain religious practice. What we are left with is a novel vision of Jainism: one that encourages subjects to let go of their lovers only after holding onto them for a lifetime or even three or four, one that demands renunciation of the world but only after conquering the eight directions as a Cakravartin king.
Figure I.1: Left panel of the Bhadrabāhu narrative screens in the Candragupta Basaḍi circa twelfth century on Candragiri at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. AIIS photo archive. All photos are my own unless otherwise noted.

Figure I.2: Right panel of the Bhadrabāhu screens. AIIS photo archive.
Figure 1.3: Signature of the artist Dāsoja on the right Bhadrabahu screen at Śravaṇa Belagola. Courtesy of Katherine Kasdorf.
Figure I.4: Direction of the Candragupta narrative (marked in red) on the left Bhadrabāhu screen. AIIS photo archive.
Figure 2.1: Map of the Rāṣṭakūṭa Empire. Via mapsofindia.com
http://www.mapsofindia.com/history/rashtrakuta-dynasty.jpg
Figure 2.2 (left): Cāvunḍarāya’s Tyāgada Pillar dated 983 C.E. on Vindhyagiri at Śravaṇa Belgola.

Figure 2.3 (below): Heggade Kaṇṇa’s epigraph dated 1180 C.E. inscribed on the palimpsestically cleared stone face of the Tyāgada Pillar.
Figure 2.4: An illustrated manuscript of Čāvundarāya (pictured here on the left with crown) at Nēmicandra’s feet (again, on the left sitting on a lion throne with his water pot at his side). S.C. Ghoshal, ed., Dravya-Samgraha of Nemichandra Siddhānta-Chakravartti: English translation with Prakrit Gāthās (text) and Sanskrit Chhāyās (renderings) and Padapāṭha (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989), unnumbered page after xxxviii.
Figure 3.1 (left): Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Indra IV’s death memorial (982 C.E.) in the form of a pillar of victory (vijayastambha) on Candragiri at Śrāvaṇa Belgoḷa.

Figure 3.2 (below): Indra IV’s pillar towering over the built landscape of Candragiri.
Figure 5.1: Bahubāli monolith on Vindhyagiri at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, constructed in 981 C.E. by Western Gaṅga General Cāvuṇḍarāya.
Figure 5.2 (left): Homage to Bāhubali bas-relief at Badāmi (circa sixth century).

Figure 5.3 (right): Kumathōsanga Pārśvanātha at Badāmi (circa sixth century).
Figure 5.4 (left): Homage to Bāhubali bas-relief in the J6 temple at Ellora (circa ninth century).

Figure 5.5 (right): Kamaṭhōpasarga Pārśvanātha bas-relief in the J6 temple at Ellora (circa ninth century).
Figure 5.6 (top): The big hill at Śravaṇa Belgola known as Vindhyagiri and Doḍḍa Beṭṭa.

Figure 5.7 (bottom): The small hill at Śravaṇa Belgola known as Candragiri and Cikka Beṭṭa.
Figure 5.8: Elevation overview of Vindhya and Candragiri at Śravaṇa Belgola. *EC* Vol. 2, Illustration 2, unnumbered page preceding page 1 of the Introduction.
Figure 5.9 (top): *Niṣidhi* memorials southwest of Candragiri at Śravaṇa Belgola.

Figure 5.10 (bottom): The worn toes of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgola.
Figure 5.11 (left): A *maṇṭapa* outside of the Bāhubali enclosure at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa that contains a statue of the Jain yakṣī Kūśmāṇḍini.

Figure 5.12 (right): The Jain yakṣī Kūśmāṇḍini that faces the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa.
Figure 5.13: The iconographically peculiar eggplant in the hand of the Kūśmāṇḍini statue at Śravaṇa Beḷgolā.
Figure 5.14 (top): Carved channels at the feet of the Bāhubali monolith designed to conduct the *abhiṣēka* fluids away from the statue for collection.

Figure 5.15 (bottom): The lotus blossom base of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa.
Figure 5.16 (top): Epigraph stating “Śrī Cāmuṇḍa Rāja had it made,” composed in Marathi in nāgari script on the right of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa.

Figure 5.17 (bottom): Epigraph stating “Śrī Cāmuṇḍa Rāja had it made,” composed in Tamil Grantha script in the first line and in Kannada in Haḷegannaḍa characters in the second line (left of the monolith).
Figure 5.18: Jain pilgrims singing and dancing in front of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa (July 2013).
Figure 5.20 (right): Bāhubali monolith Kārkaḷa constructed 1432 C.E.

Figure 5.19 (left): The Bāhubali monolith at Gommaṭagiri (circa twelfth century). Courtesy of Caleb Simmons.
Figure 5.21 (right): The Bāhubali monolith at Vēṇūr constructed in 1604 C.E. Courtesy of Caleb Simmons.

Figure 5.22 (right): The Bāhubali monolith at Kumboj constructed in 1963.
Figure 5.23: The Bāhubali monolith at Vēṇūr, constructed in 1604 C.E. Courtesy of Caleb Simmons.
Figure 5.24: Red arrow marking the location of the Boppaṇa Inscription at Śravaṇa Belgola.
Figure 5.25: Boppaṇa’s inscribed stele at Sravaṇa Belgola.
Figure 5.26: A Kukkuṭasarpa, a half-rooster half-snake beast, that is the vehicle of the Goddess Padmāvati. EC Vol. 2, Illustration 7, unnumbered page preceding page 27 of the Introduction.
Figure C.1: Map of the contemporary Jain mathas in South India. Cartography by David Meek.
Figure C.2 (top): Pañcakūṭa Basaḍi at the Huṃca Maṭha c. 12th c.

Figure C.3 (bottom): Caturmukha Basaḍi at Kārkaḷa Maṭha, constructed in 1586 C.E.
Figure C.4 (top): Narasimharājapura Maṭha buildings.

Figure C.5 (bottom): Sāvira Kambada Basaḍi at Müḍbidrī, constructed in 1430 C.E.
Figure C.6 (top): Bhaṭṭākaḷaṅka Bhaṭṭāraka in front of the Sonda Maṭha Temple.

Figure C.7 (bottom): The maṭha complex at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa.
Figure C.8: Kere Basaḍi at the Varāṅga Maṭha.
Figure C.9 (top): Throne at the Narasimharājapura Maṭha under a photo of the former Lakṣmīsēna Bhaṭṭāraka.

Figure C.10 (bottom): Cārukīrti Bhaṭṭāraka’s throne on the right hand side of the Bāhubali monolith at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa.
Figure C.11: The bhaṭṭāraka’s throne at the Varāṅga Maṭha. This is the most elaborate of all the thrones that I have seen in the Deccani Jain maṭhas and perhaps gives us a sense of what medieval South Asian thrones may have looked like.
Figure C.12: Cārukīrti Bhaṭṭāraka enthroned at the Mūḍbidrī Maṭh
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