

THE GOLD OF GODS
STORIES OF TEMPLE FINANCING FROM JAIN PRABANDHAS*

Basile Leclère

For members of the Jain lay community, the question of how much property one was allowed to keep and how much was to be given away grew in importance in the course of time and was tackled with by authors of treatises on lay conduct. In the *Yogaśāstra*, Hemacandra summarised the doctrine in the following terms:

“One who is firm in his vows and sows his wealth on the seven fields with devotion as well as on the most miserable people out of compassion, such a person is said to be a great layman.”¹

The seven fields mentioned here encompass members of the fourfold Jain community, sacred texts, Jain images and Jain temples. Thus it was a major religious duty to provide the community not only with temples for performing rituals, but also with other kinds of buildings where the coreligionists could gather, eat, stay and so. Accordingly, great Jain laymen from medieval times got involved in such building activities and were concerned about making it known in very laudatory terms by means of inscriptions or literary texts produced by the writers they patronised. For instance, Hemacandra duly extolled the ambitious programme of temple building launched by his royal patron Kumārapāla: in the *Mahāvīracarita* which concludes his monumental work on the lives of the sixty-three illustrious men, the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, he had the last Jina himself predict that Kumārapāla, “with unlimited power, will make this earth adorned with temples of the Jinas in almost every village”.² Similarly, the poet Someśvara celebrated the building frenzy of the Jain ministers

* I thank Christine Chojnacki for helping me to improve this paper with her remarks and Gilles Martin-Rosset for kindly checking my English.

¹ *evaṃ vrata-sthito bhaktyā sapta-kṣetryāṃ dhanam vapan | dayayā cātīdīneṣu mahā-śrāvaka ucyate || Yogaśāstra III. 119, tr. Qvarnström 2002: 69 (with some modifications). Cf. Williams 1963: 164f.*

² *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra X. 12. 75, tr. Johnson 1962: 311.*

Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla in hyperbolic terms in the eulogy he composed for the consecration of the Lūṅigavasahī temple on Mont Abu:

“Of the uninterrupted series of religious establishments, such as tanks, wells, fountains, groves, ponds, temples, alms-houses and so on, which were either newly constructed or repaired by that pair of brothers in every town or village, on every road and mountain-top, one does not even know the number; it is at best but the earth that knows it.”³

In his *Kīrtikaumudī*, however, Someśvara gave more factual information about the architectural achievements of his patrons besides praising them broadly from the outset.⁴ For instance, he said that Vastupāla had two temples built on Mount Śatruñjaya, one dedicated to Nemi and the other one to Pārśva, which statement is confirmed by other sources.⁵ Similarly, Arisimha enumerated in the eleventh and last canto of his *Sukṛtasamkīrtana* forty-three Jain and non-Jain buildings that had been erected or restored by Vastupāla.⁶ The purpose of such lists was obviously to give an idea of the munificence of these laymen. But conspicuously no precise amount of money is given in these sources, perhaps because such information was considered too prosaic to be included in a poem. I thus intend to investigate in this paper what the Prabandha literature, reputed to register data of different kinds, tells us about the funding of Jain temples.⁷ Prabandha texts include the biographies of more or less legendary laymen from

³ *tena bhrātr-yugena yā pratipura-grāmādhva-śaila-sthalaṃ vāpī-kūpa-nipāna-kānana-saraḥ-prāsāda-satrādikā | dharmma-sthāna-paramparā navatarā cakre'tha jīṇoddhṛtā tat-samkhyāpi na budhyate yadi param tad-vedinī medinī* || Inscription n°I, v. 66, tr. Lüders 1905-1906: 218. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, Merutuṅga ascribes to Someśvara another hyperbolic stanza in praise of his patron and friend: “Vastupāla has obstructed the earth with doles of food and drinking-fountains and religious foundations, and with his glory the circle of the sky” (*anna-dānaiḥ payaḥ-pānair dharmma-sthānair dharā-talaṃ | yaśasā vastupālasya ruddham ākāśa-maṇḍalaṃ* || PCi 105. 8, tr. Tawney 1991: 167). Other inscriptions from Girnar contend that Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla founded several millions of new religious buildings (*koṭīśaḥ*), which statement Bühler dismisses as “absurd boastfulness” (Bühler 1902: 491).

⁴ “Even the ignorants could notice the itinerary of the minister’s journey thanks to the decaded Jain temples he had restored and the charming ponds full of lotuses he had recently dug” (*samuddhṛtair jīṇa-jinendra-harmyair navaiḥ sarobhiś ca saroja-ramyaiḥ | prasthāna-mārgaḥ sacivasya so'bhūd ajānatām apy upalakṣaṇīyaḥ | Kīrtikaumudī* IX. 19, cf. Khataavate 1961: 52; Bühler 1902: 490).

⁵ *Kīrtikaumudī* IX. 31-33. These sources are Arisimha’s *Sukṛtasamkīrtana*, XI. 16 and Jinahaṛṣa’s *Vastupāla-carita*, VI. 631-632, cf. Bühler 1902: 490, 492.

⁶ Bühler 1902: 491.

⁷ Besides being replete with valuable chronological information, the Prabandha corpus has for instance provided some clues about how much money was required for having texts copied down in medieval times, cf. Chojnacki 2019: 33-6.

a remote past such as the universal sovereign Bharata or the merchant Jāvāḍi, who are archetypes of temple builders,⁸ but I will focus in this article on historical figures from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, starting with the most famous ones, the Caulukya king Kumārapāla and the ministers Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla.

1. Lavish temple endowments by Jain laypeople

An investigation of the most renowned text from the Prabandha corpus, Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (1305), teaches us that hyperbolic language was not specific to the laudatory texts composed at the time of the erection of the buildings. In the account of Kumārapāla's reign, the chronicler thus credits this king with the erection of a total number of 1,440 temples.⁹ He also mentions more precisely the construction of new temples which are known from other sources,¹⁰ as well as the renovation of older ones, but with no reference to the costs incurred.¹¹ The only mention of a precise sum is to be found in the account of Kumārapāla's pilgrimage to holy places: it is said that the king spent 63 lakhs at Girnar for the sake of new stairs.¹² Merutuṅga also mentions many religious foundations of the brothers Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla,¹³ but he never talks about their funding, with the single exception of

⁸ Cf. Granoff 1992: 304.

⁹ PCi 86. 11; Tawney 1991: 133 cf. Leclère 2017: 2 n. 6. The number of 1444 temples found by C. H. Tawney in one manuscript of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* also appears in Ratnamandira's *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī: hemācārya-pratibodhita-śrī-kumārapāla-bhūpālena tāraṇadurga-stambhapurādiṣu 1444 navīnāḥ suvarṇa-daṇḍa-kalaśa-kaliṭāḥ prāsādāḥ kāritāḥ* (UpTar 104. 11-12).

¹⁰ For the list of these temples, see Leclère 2017: 2-3.

¹¹ When dealing with the temple of Hemacandra's ascetic initiation at Stambhatīrtha, Merutuṅga suggests that Kumārapāla spent a lot of money on its renovation by saying that no other one could be compared to it: *atha stambhatīrthe sāmānye sāligavasahikā-prāsāde yatra prabhūṇām dīkṣā-kṣaṇo babhūva ratna-maya-bimbālankṛto nirupamo jīrṇoddhāraḥ kāritāḥ* (PCi 91. 11-12). "Then in Stambhatīrtha, in the general temple of Sāligavasahikā, where the ceremony of the lord Hemacandra as a monk took place, the king restored in a magnificent way a decayed edifice and adorned it with an image made out of precious stone" (tr. Tawney 1991: 142-143, 146).

¹² *chatra-śilā-mārgaṃ parihṛtya parasmin jīrṇa-prākāra-pakṣe navya-padyā-karaṇāya śrī-vāgbhaṭadeva ādiṣṭaḥ | padyopakṣaye vyayikṛtās triṣaṣṭi-lakṣāḥ |* (PCi 93. 12-13). Kumārapāla had these new stairs made in order to avoid a rock shaped as an umbrella (*chatra-śilā*) that would fall down, some people say, if two meritorious men passed under it at the same time. This rock was located near the stone seat where Nemi was said to have taken his initiation, as we learn from the second Kalpa of the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* (Cort 1993: 251f.; Chojnacki 1995a: 154).

¹³ He gives a list in his account of the great pilgrimage organised by Vastupāla in 1220 (PCi 100. 4 to 102. 9, tr. Tawney 1991: 157-62). According to Ratnamandira, the two brothers had 1,313 new temples built and 1,300 old ones restored (UpTar 114. 3). The symmetry of these numbers as well as their similarity with the number of

the Nemi temple that Tejaḥpāla had built at the village of Bāulā at the cost of 36,000 coins.¹⁴ In a similar way, Jinaprabha frequently alludes in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* (1333) to the role Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla played in renovating decayed temples or having new ones built, but he does not say a word about their cost.¹⁵ And when he comes to talk about the new stairs Kumārapāla had made by his governor at Girnar, he skips the mention of how much money was spent on them.¹⁶

In contrast with this silence, other Prabandha collections contain much more evidence. In the *Prabandhakośa* (1348), Rājaśekhara when coming to the question of the ministers' pious actions seems at first to eschew the task: "Who is able to count up the religious foundations of the illustrious Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla?" But immediately after, he adds that he has collected some information from his own master, and starts with an impressive number of image installations (one lakh) and the huge amounts of money lavished by the two brothers on the three major holy places:

temples Kumārapāla is said to have built (see above n. 9) underline their symbolic nature. The distinction between new temples and restored temples was of some importance, since the renovation of an old and decayed temple conveyed more merits than the foundation of a new one as Ratnamandira's teacher's teacher Ratnaśekhara put it in his *Śrāddhavidhiprakaraṇa* (cf. Cort 2016: 106).

¹⁴ *varṣa-tritaya-devatāvasarāyapadena pṛthak-kṛtena ṣaṭ-triṃśat-sahasra-pramāṇena dravyeṇa bāulā-grāme śrīneminātha-prāsādaḥ samajani* | (PCi 99. 17-18). Besides this isolated mention of a precise sum, Merutuṅga gives an idea of the brothers' lavishness when he indicates which costly materials they used for such or such monument. For instance, he narrates how sixteen pillars of Kaṇṭheliya stone were brought by water for the construction of the Nandīśvara temple on Śatruñjaya (PCi 100. 24-27, tr. Tawney 1991: 159). The silence of the chronicler about the probably high cost of these constructions contrasts sharply with his propensity to give details when he comes to Vastupāla's generosity towards individuals: according to him, the minister rewarded twice Someśvara for composing beautiful stanzas with a large sum of money (16 thousands *drammas* one time and 8 thousands the other time) and he similarly gave 4 thousands to the Paṇḍit Jayadeva, 15 thousands to a poor Brahmin, and 1 thousand *drammas* for the appointment of Paṇḍit Bālacandra as teacher (PCi 102. 28 to 103. 17, tr. Tawney 1991: 163f.).

¹⁵ In the third Kalpa dedicated to Mount Girnar, Jinaprabha describes in five stanzas (v. 9-13) the sacred complex Vastupāla built there, with reference to some particular buildings such as the Śatruñjayāvatāra (VTK 7. 10-14, tr. Chojnacki 1995a: 148-149) and he even inserts a detailed list of the brothers' pious foundations in the precincts of this holy place in the fifth Kalpa (tr. Chojnacki 1995a: 161-163), but neither of these texts contains any mention of precise amounts of money (even though the Prakrit prose of the latter gave more opportunity to do so than the Sanskrit metric structure of the former). Jinaprabha also describes to some extent the features of the famous Lūṅigavasati temple the ministers had built on Mount Abu in the eighth Kalpa and even gives the name of the architect Śobhanadeva (v. 43-46), but he does not say a word about how much money the complex costed (VTK 16. 13-16, tr. Cort 1993: 260; Chojnacki 1995a: 176).

¹⁶ *cālukka-cakki-siri-kumārapāla-nariṃda-saṃṭhavia-soraṭṭha-damḍāhiveṇa siri-sirimāla-kulubbhaveṇa bārasa-saya-vīse* (1220) *vikkama-saṃvacchare pajjā kārāvī* | (VTK 9. 24-25, tr. Chojnacki 1995a: 161).

“Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla spent eighteen crores and ninety-six lakhs on Śatruñjaya, twelve crores and eighty lakhs on Girnar, and twelve crores and fifty-three lakhs for the erection of the Lūṅigavasati on Abu.”¹⁷

The sum of 12 crores and 53 lakhs is also mentioned in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* in reference to the Nemi temple of Abu,¹⁸ and the latter collection also agrees with the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* about the sum of 63 lakhs of *drammas* that was spent to create new steps at Girnar under the reign of Kumārapāla.¹⁹

In later Prabandha texts, we paradoxically find more precise information about the funding of famous temples. For instance, Jinaharṣa says in his biography of Vastupāla, the *Vastupālacarita* (1441), that the minister deposited 1,000 *dīnāras* in the treasury of Pārśvanātha for the restoration of the temple dedicated to this Jina at Stambhana.²⁰ In the roughly contemporary *Upadeśataranṅiṇī*,²¹ Ratnamandira tells us the impressive cost of one of the most famous temples of Kumārapāla:

“In Pattana, Kumārapāla had the Tihūṅavihāra erected and marked with the name of his own father Tribhuvanapāla. It was endowed with seventy-two little shrines. In these were installed twenty-four images made of precious stones, twenty-four made of brass, twenty-four made of silver, fourteen made of one *bhāra* of gold each.²² In the main temple he had an image of Neminātha made

¹⁷ *etayoś ca śrī-vastupāla-tejaḥpālayor dharmasthāna-saṅkhyāṃ karttuṃ ka īśvaraḥ paraṃ guru-mukha-śrutam kiñcil likhyate - lakṣam ekaṃ sapādam jina-bimbānāṃ vidhāpitam | aṣṭādaśa koṭyaḥ ṣaṅ-ṇavatir lakṣāḥ śrī-śatruñjaya-tīrthe draviṇaṃ vyayitam | dvādaśa koṭyo 'śtīr lakṣāḥ śrī-ujjayante | dvādaśa koṭyas tri-pañcāśal lakṣā arbuda-giri-śikhare lūṅigavasatyāṃ | PK 129. 13-16, cf. Sandesara 1953: 37f.*

¹⁸ PPS 53. 2.

¹⁹ *mahaṃ āmbākasya śrī-kumāra-devena surāṣṭra-vyāpāro dattaḥ | tena vrajatā mahaṃ bāhaḍa-devo vijñaptaḥ | tatra gato 'haṃ raivate padyāṃ kārayāmi | mantriṇoktam – kāryā | paścāt tena tatra padyā kāritā | vyaye bhīmaprī-dramma-lakṣa 63 | itaḥ kumāreśo yātrāyāṃ āgataḥ | (PPS 34. 24-26). However it must be noted that here the stairs are made at the command of Āmbāka, the governor of Surāṣṭra, before king Kumārapāla makes his pilgrimage.*

²⁰ *Vastupālacarita* VI. 518, cf. Bühler 1902: 493.

²¹ This approximate datation of Ratnamandira can be deduced from the information we have about the life and career of his teacher's teacher Ratnaśekhara, an *ācārya* of the Tapā Gaccha: born in 1395, ordained in 1406 and elevated to the rank of *sūri* in 1445, he wrote several texts – a commentary on the *Śrāddha-pratikramaṇasūtra* (1439), the *Śrāddhavidhi* (1449) and the *Ācārapradīpa* (1459) – and eventually passed away in 1460 (cf. Williams 1963: 16; Cort 2016: 104-106).

²² With consideration for the other compound words that precede *bhāramayyaḥ*, I think that the word *bhāra*, which etymologically means a weight or a load of any kind, implicitly refers here to a particular weight of gold, as the materials seem to be listed in an order of increasing value. According to the Monier-Williams dictionary, 1 *bhāra*

that was carved from a single unbroken precious stone measuring one hundred twenty-four *āṅgulas*. The expense of money amounted to ninety-six crores.”²³

The Prabandha collections thus agree in that temple building required very important amounts of money. Indeed, what strikes us in these accounts is not the occasional mention of such or such currency,²⁴ but the almost systematic use of the very high units of lakh and crore to measure the wealth required to achieve these architectural programmes.²⁵

Now, we have to ascertain where all that money actually came from. In all likelihood, the construction of temples could not convey any merit to the donator unless he drew on his own personal fortune to finance it. As a matter of fact, a particular stress is laid in Jain narrative literature on the origin of the money spent on any kind of patronage. In theory one could not even make use of his inheritance for that purpose, and that is why the sons of wealthy merchants are often depicted as going abroad in order to earn money by themselves and secure the possibility of making meritorious gifts.²⁶ Most significantly, Georg Bühler took it for granted

is equal to 20 *tulās* and 2000 *palas* of gold, and 1 *pala* is equal to 4 *karṣas*. As 1 *karṣa* corresponds to 176 grains, and 1 grain to 0,06 gram (Sircar 1983: 247 n. 1), 1 *karṣa* weighs 10,5 grams, and 1 *bhāra* 84,48 kilograms. It could be understood that the word *bhāra* encompasses the total weight of the fourteen images, but given that the brass image of Ādinātha installed in the Vimalavasahī temple is said to weigh 18 *bhāras* (Jayantavijaya 1954: 29), it is not unlikely that those images were made of one *bhāra* of gold each.

²³ *pattane sva-pitr-tribhuvanapālasya nāmāṅkitaḥ tihunavihāraḥ kārītaḥ 72 devakulikāyutaḥ tāsu 24 pratimā ratnamayyaḥ 24 pittala-mayyaḥ 24 rūpyamayyaḥ 14 bhāramayyaḥ mukhya-prāsade 1 śata 24 āṅgula-pramāṅārīṣṭa-ratna-mayī neminātha-pratimā kārītā tatra dravya-vyayaḥ 96 koṭī-pramāṅaḥ* | (UpTar p. 104-105).

²⁴ Different kinds of coins are mentioned in the texts, silver *ṭāṅkakas*, golden *dīnāras*, and *drammas* of *bhīmaprīya* and *vīsalaprīya* types or without any mention of type (cf. nn. 19, 37, 38, 42, 43, 48, 54, 58).

²⁵ According to the Jain tradition, a total of 18 crores and 53 lakhs were spent on the erection of the Vimalavasahī temple of Mount Abu, which will be taken into account below. Jayantavijaya Muni thinks that this sum is not improbable since the plot of land alone might have been purchased at the price of 45 crores and 36 lakhs (Jayantavijaya 1954: 28 n. 2).

²⁶ In Uddyotana’s *Kuvalayamālā*, for instance, the son of a wealthy merchant, Sāgaradatta by name, wants to reward an actor with one lakh of rupees for reciting a beautiful stanza, but he is publicly humiliated by someone who compares him to a thief as the money he lavishes was not earned by himself but by his ancestors. Full of shame, Sāgaradatta decides to leave and to kill himself if he does not acquire seven crores within the span of one year (Chojnacki 2008b: 322-24). The desire of acquiring his own wealth also urges the son of merchant called Nāgadatta to go abroad in the anonymous *Kathākośa* from the eleventh century, but it is provoked by the emulation of some pious man performing in a Jain temple a religious ceremony of eight kinds as well as the recollection of a Prakrit stanza: “Who cannot increase the inherited property acquired by his father and transmitted by him to his children? But seldom does a mother give birth to a man who without wealth is himself enterprising” (*piyara-vidhattai ḍimḥḥadai dugu dugu ku ku na karei* | *sai-vidhavanā sai-vilasaṅā viralā jaṅaṅi jaṅei* || *Kathākośa* ed. Hoffman, p. 75, tr. Tawney 1975: 28).

that Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla “spent a great part of their rich incomes on the erection of temples, asylums and benevolent institutions so that at least the outward lustre of the Jainas was restored.”²⁷ Yet the Prabandhas do not state so explicitly that the brothers used their own fortune, and for instance Merutuṅga explains just once how Tejaḥpāla collected the sum of 36,000 coins he needed for having a temple of Neminātha built “by laying aside a quarter of his income for the worship of the gods during three years,”²⁸ and there is no further evidence in this text that either his brother or himself did the same for all the other religious foundations they are credited with. Among the other writers, Ratnamandira seems to be the only one to declare that the two brothers carried out the construction or renovation of Jain as well as non-Jain temples “with their own wealth” (*nija-dhanair*),²⁹ but he does not specify by which means they acquired this wealth. All we know from the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī* (and from a parallel account preserved in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* under the title *Lūṅigavasahīprabandha*) is that after enduring poverty during their youth, the two brothers were freed of it “once they took office.”³⁰ Then they earned enough money to buy a piece of land on Mount Abu close to the famous Vimalavasahī temple and had the Lūṅigavasahī temple built there in order to fulfil the last will of their late brother Lūṅiga.³¹ Whether the brothers were enriched by their official position of minister or got simultaneously involved in some commerce, neither of these sources tells us. But elsewhere in the Prabandha corpus, we come across two very singular stories about the way Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla became rich. One is to be found in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, and tells how Vastupāla, when appointed as governor of Stambhatīrtha, came to appropriate most of the wealth of a local Muslim merchant called Said

²⁷ Bühler 1902: 488. Other scholars such as Khatavate and Sandesara tackled the issue of where that money actually came from and gave in their studies a brief survey of the narratives discussed here (Khatavate 1961: 55; Sandesara 1953: 36).

²⁸ *varṣa-tritaya-devatāvasarāyapadena pṛthak-kṛtena* (PCi 99. 17; tr. Tawney 1991: 157, cf. above n. 14). According to Sandesara and Thaker (1962: 20), the *devatāvasarāyapada* is the “item of income in the festivals of the presiding deity of a temple.”

²⁹ UpTar 114. 9.

³⁰ *vyāpāre jāte* (PPS 52. 32; UpTar 115. 2). Given the polysemy of *vyāpāra*, the expression could also mean “once they started up in business”, but other occurrences in the Prabandha corpus point to the meaning of “political function”: for instance “the charge of Surāṣṭra was given by the illustrious king Kumārapāla to the honourable Āmbāka” (*mahaṃ° āmbākasya śrī-kumāra-devena surāṣṭrā-vyāpāro dattaḥ*, PPS 34. 24 cf. above n. 19); “then, as soon as he had obtained his charge, the honourable Tejaḥpāla was appointed to the charge of the glorious city of Stambhatīrtha” (*atha vyāpāre prāpte mahaṃ° śrī-tejaḥpālaḥ śrī-stambhatīrtha-vyāpārāya prahitaḥ* PPS 73. 20 cf. below n. 32).

³¹ PPS 52. 27-33; UpTar 114. 12; cf. Laughlin 2003: 299f.

who had rebelled against his authority.³² The other story reports that while making a pilgrimage the two brothers reached a village named Haḍālā and decided to bury a part of their fortune in the vicinity for fear of thieves. They were doing so when they happened to find a treasure of gold. On the advice of Tejaḥpāla's wife Anupamadevī, they used that money to build temples on Mount Śatruñjaya and Mount Girnar.³³ The earliest known version of the story opens the biography of Vastupāla that Rājaśekhara has inserted in the *Prabandhakośa*:³⁴

“The illustrious Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla went on a pilgrimage to Śatruñjaya, Girnar and other holy places. Once they had arrived at the village of Haḍālā, they thought about their fortune, and it then turned out that the whole of it amounted to three lakhs. Having then considered that their own security was not guaranteed in Surāṣṭra, they wanted to deposit one lakh into the ground and to do so they had the base of a great fig tree (*aśvattha*) dug up at night. While they were having the ground dug up, an ancient copper jar full of gold that might have belonged to someone came forth. Vastupāla took it and as he had much consideration for Tejaḥpāla's wife Anupamadevī, he asked her where it should be deposited. She said: ‘It must be placed high up on a mountain-top, so that it may not become the property of anyone else, as it could happen to the treasure we are talking about.’ Hearing that, the illustrious Vastupāla spent that wealth on Śatruñjaya, Ujjayanta³⁵ and other illustrious mountains. Having made his pilgrimage, he travelled back and arrived at Dhavalakka.”

³² PPS p. 56-57; Sandesara 1953: 36 n. 2; Khatavate 1961: 55. Merutuṅga knows about the rivalry between Vastupāla and Saida, but he mentions it very briefly as the starting-point of the war with Śaṅkha, the king of Bhṛgukaccha, since Saida asked the latter for help. It is also said in the lesson translated by Tawney that Saida is killed after Vastupāla's victory over Śaṅkha, but the sentence is missing in two manuscripts (PCi 102. 10-20, tr. Tawney 1991: 162-163). The *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* contains another version of the conflict with Saida at Stambhatīrtha, wherein Vastupāla is replaced by his brother Tejaḥpāla (PPS 73. 20-28).

³³ Sandesara 1953: 36 n. 3; Khatavate 1961: 54f.

³⁴ *śrī-vastupāla-tejaḥpālau śrī-śatruñjaya-girinārādi-tīrtha-yātrāyai prasthitau | haḍālā-grāmaṃ gatvā yāvat svām bhūtiṃ cintayantas tāval lakṣa-trayaṃ jātaṃ sarvaṃ svam | tataḥ surāṣṭrāsvasausthyam ākalayya lakṣam ekam avanyāṃ nidhātuṃ niśīthe mahāśvattha-talaṃ khānayām āsatuḥ | tayoḥ khānayatoḥ kasyāpi prāktanah kanaka-pūrṇaḥ śaulva-kalaśo niragāt | tam ādāya śrī-vastupālaḥ tejaḥpāla-jāyām anupamadevīṃ mānyatayā aprcchat kva etan nidhīyate | tayoktam giri-śikhare etad uccaiḥ sthāpyate | yathā prastuta-nidhi-van nānyasād bhavati | tat śrutvā śrī-vastupālaḥ tad-dravyaṃ śrī-śatruñjayojjayantādau avyayayat | kṛta-yātro vyāvṛtto dhavalakka-puram agāt |* (PK 101. 6-13).

³⁵ Ujjayanta is another name of Mount Girnar.

One century later, Jinaharṣa and Ratnamandira retold this story with some variations.³⁶ In the *Upadeśataranṅiṇī*, the narrative runs as follows:

“On their first pilgrimage the illustrious Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla left Dhavalakka in the company of an important community. They arrived at the village of Haḍālā. In the meantime they had heard about the fear of thieves launching attacks on the road. At that point they mutually deliberated and during the night, they took some copper jars containing one lakh of silver *ṭaṅkakas*,³⁷ and with very trustworthy servants they went to a mimosa (*śamī*) that stood in the middle of a wheat field located near a pool. They dug there, and in the meantime, thanks to Vastupāla’s good luck, a golden treasure came forth in front of them. They were greatly bewildered. They stored their own fortune at the same place. Hereafter they came back overwhelmed by anxiety. Then Anupamadevī asked them the reason of their anxiety. They told her in private. After that she said: ‘My lord, the fortune must not be hidden this way. It must be hidden in such way that everybody may see it but cannot take it. What is the meaning? You should have temples built. This is the conduct of good men.’”³⁸

To sum up, even in the case of famous Jain laymen whose life is well documented, the origin of the fortune they possessed and more specifically of the money they invested in temple building is not easy to establish. Did they earn it solely through their business? Did they take any advantage of their official position, as suggested by the story of the Muslim merchant Said? One could also mention here the story of the minister Sajjana who deftly used a part of the income he collected as governor of Saurāṣṭra to finance the renovation of Mount Girnar, and succeeded in making the king Jayasiṃha Siddharāja eventually approve his behaviour by

³⁶ Khatavate 1961: 55.

³⁷ The words *ṭaṅka* and *ṭaṅkaka* refer to a coin, which is often a golden coin as indicated by the compound words *hemataṅkaka* or *sauvarṇataṅkaka*, but it can also be made of silver. Accordingly, *taṅkaśālā* or “room for coins” means a mint (cf. Sandesara and Thaker 1962: 19, 65, 99, 101).

³⁸ *śrī-vastupāla-tejaḥpālau prathama-yātrāyāṃ bhūri-saṅgha-yutau dhavalakkakāt haḍālā-grāme samāgatau tāvatā māрге dhātī-luṅṭāka-bhūtiḥ śrutā tadā parasparam ālocya niśāyāṃ rūpya-ṭaṅkaka-lakṣa-bhṛta-tāmra-kalaśān gṛhītvā paramāpta-sevakaiḥ saha taṭākāsanna-godhūma-kṣetra-madhyastha-śamī-taru-tale samāgatāḥ | khanitaṃ tatra tāvatā vastupāla-bhāgyena nidhiḥ sauvarṇaḥ saṃmukho nirgataḥ | mahān vismayāḥ samajani | svadhanam tad api tatraiva sthāpitam | paścād āgatau paraṃ cintāturau tadā maṃ^o anupamadevyā cintāyāḥ kāraṇam pṛṣṭham | nirvijane proktaṃ tābhyām | tadānu tayoktam – svāmin dhanam itthaṃ na guptīkriyate tathā guptīkriyate yathā sarve’pi paśyanti paraṃ grahituṃ na śaknuvanti | ko’rthaḥ - prāsādāḥ kāryante | sat-puruṣāṇām ayam evācāraḥ | (UpTar 113. 7 to 114. 1).*

offering him all the merit of such a pious deed.³⁹ But we can find in the Prabandhas even more surprising stories which insist on the role some supernatural beings play in securing the necessary amount of money. It appears then that laypeople are merely the initiators of the project, or even the instruments of the deities.

2. The intervention of gods

A first story of temple building wherein deities play a major role concerns the famous Vimalavasatikā or Vimalavasahī which as indicated by its name was erected on Mount Abu by the minister Vimala in the first half of the eleventh century. As Jinaprabha puts it in the eighth Kalpa, which deals with Mount Abu, that great Jain layman propitiated the Jain goddess Ambā and noticing a plot of land near the temple of the Hindu goddess Śrīmātā that was marked by the presence of *campaka* tree and other auspicious signs, he bought it and “expended much wealth to build there the beautiful temple called Vimalavasati in Vikrama 1088.”⁴⁰ Here the deities are merely alluded to, but they are credited in the parallel versions of that temple foundation with a much more active role. In the *Prabandhakośa*, it is Ambā who, after assenting to Vimala’s request, takes the initiative to ask her friend Śrīmātā for the permission to erect a Jain temple on Mount Abu,⁴¹ and the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* even states that the friendship between the goddesses is the primary cause of the temple’s foundation. In this version, Śrīmātā herself asks Ambā to come and settle on Abu, and in order to help her have her own residence there, she provides her with a plot of land where 27 lakhs of *drammas* are hidden at the base of two trees of the *bakula* and *campaka* varieties. Ambā then looks for someone to carry out the erection of her temple and manifests herself to Vimala for that

³⁹ PCi 65. 14-22, tr. Tawney 1991: 96; PPS 34. 1-22; UpTar 109. 1-11. There is also a short allusion to the role played by Sajjana in the construction of a new temple of Nemi on Mount Girnar in the fifth Kalpa of the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* dedicated to this holy place (*puvviṃ gujjara-dhārāe jayasimha-deveṇaṃ khaṃgāra-rāyaṃ haṇittā sajjano daṃḍahivo thāvio | teṇa a ahiṇavaṃ nemi-jīṇiṃda-bhavaṇaṃ egārasa-saya-paṃcāsī (1185) vikkama-rāya-vacchare kārāviam | VTK 9. 22-23, cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 161).*

⁴⁰ *ārādhyāmbāṃ bhagavatīm putra-saṃpadapasrhaḥ | tīrtha-sthāpanam abhyarthyā campaka-druma-saṃnidhau || 37 || puṣpa-sragdāma-ruciraṃ dṛṣṭvā gomaya-gomukham | tatrāgrahīd bhuvaṃ daṇḍeṭ śrīmātur bhavanāntike || 38 || ... vaikrame vasu-vasv-āsā-(1088)-mite’bde bhūri-rai-vyayāt | sat-prāsādaṃ sa vimala-vasaty-āhvaṃ vyadhāpayat || 40 || (VTK 16. 7-8, 10). The auspicious sign is “a sprout made of cowdung garlanded with flowers” according to John Cort, while Christine Chojnacki understands the expression *puṣpa-sragdāma-ruciraṃ gomaya-gomukham* as meaning a cowdung shaped in the shape of a cow face and illuminated by a garland of flowers (Cort 1993: 259f.; Chojnacki 1995a: 174f.). In Ratnamandira’s account, cowdung is also mentioned as the means to identify the right place, but it has a different form (see below n. 43).*

⁴¹ PK 121. 18-30 cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 174 n. 23.

purpose.⁴² In the later rewriting of Ratnamandira in the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī*, Śrīmātā is even more generous, since Vimala finds the much greater sum of 72 lakhs when digging the ground under the trees.⁴³

A second story where the costs of temple building are covered by supernatural beings is the one told about the Jain holy place of Phalavardhi or Phalodhi in Rajasthan. According to the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, this small village became a sanctuary when an image of Pārśva was miraculously discovered there by a layman inside a lump of earth (*leṣṭu*) that was located in the middle of a shrubbery (*jāli-vana-madhye*). The account is rather short and directly

⁴² PPS 51. 30 to 52. 13. The story is rewritten by Ratnamandira in the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī* and intertwined with the parallel story of Vimala who wants to redeem the murder of men at war and is told by his spiritual guide Dharmasārasūri to do meritorious acts such as proclaiming interdiction to kill living beings (*amārī*) or building temples. Vimala then propitiates the goddess Ambā and asks for two boons, the birth of a son and the erection of a temple. Ambā tells him to choose between these, and he eventually selects the temple after a discussion with his wife Śrīdevī (the motif of the temple founder putting at stake his own life or the lives of children to come is typical of such narratives, cf. Granoff 1992: 309, 314f.). At that point, the narrative meets up with the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*: Ambā pays a visit to her friend Śrīmātā on Mount Abu, and being asked to stay there, she replies that she cannot do so without a Jain temple. Śrīmātā then gives her a plot of land endowed with 72 lakhs of *drammas* buried under the *campaka* and *bakula* trees. Yet there is one more episode in Ratnamandira's account, the building of the temple being hindered during six months by a Nāga named Valīnāha (see below n. 64).

⁴³ “Then Śrīmātā gave to Ambikā a plot of land endowed with 72 lakhs of *drammas* situated under a *bakula* and a *campaka*. Being that told by Ambikā, Vimala along with the king of Candrāvātī and the twelve Suratrāṇas who attended him dug at the base of the trees that had been identified thanks to a row of saffron-coloured cowdungs. The treasure of 72 lakhs came out of the ground, and Vimala had the temple built” (*tataḥ śrīmātāmbikāyā bakula-campakayor adhaḥ 72 lakṣa-dramma-yutā bhūmiḥ samarpitā | tato 'mbikā-vacasā candrāvātīśa-12-suratrāṇa-sevya-vimalena kuṅkuma-gomayāvalikābhijñānena pādaḥ khanitaḥ 72 lakṣa-dravya-nidhānaṃ nirgatam prāsādo maṇḍitaḥ | UpTar 112. 5-7; for the different meanings of maṇḍ, see Sandesara and Thaker 1962: 176*). According to Ratnamandira's version, Vimala fled from the capital of Gujarat because he had been calumniated in presence of king Bhīma. Then he went to Candrāvātī, whose king Dhārāvarṣa took to flight and went to the country of Sind by fear of him. Vimala settled in his palace and was made king by the governors of that country. With his powerful army he won over a hundred of kings, such as the rulers of Śākambharī, Medapāṭa and Jāvālipura, and held the royal parasol over Mount Abu. Sometime later, twelve Suratrāṇas or Sultans from the city of Roma unexpectedly came there with an impressive array of forces, but they were defeated and became the servants of Vimala (*śrī-vimala-daṇḍanāyako gūjaratrādhipa-śrī-bhīma-pradhānaḥ khala-dūṣita-rāja-cittaṃ jñātvā rātrau pattanāt pañca-śata-sārāśva-parivṛtaḥ pañca-koṭi-hemoṣṭra-śambalo naṣṭvā candrāvatyāṃ gataḥ tad-bhītyā 18-śatādhipa-dhārāvarṣa-nṛpo naṣṭaḥ sindhu-deśe gataḥ | tadanu tad-āvāse sthītas tatrātya-māṇḍalikais tatra nṛpatiḥ kṛtaḥ | prabala-sainyaḥ śākambharī-medapāṭa-jāvālipurādi-nṛpati-śataṃ sādhayitvārbudopari cchattram adhāra-yat | tenaikadā roma-nagarādhipa-12-suratrāṇā akasmān mahā-sainya-melāpakaṃ kṛtvā suptā eva veṣṭitā yuddhe bhagnāḥ kiṅkarāḥ saṃjātāḥ (UpTar 110.12 to 111. 4)*). As Dhārāvarṣa fled westwards, I understand that he induced these Sultans to attack Abu, and that he became Vimala's servant as well when they lost the war. That colourful narrative is full of historical inconsistencies, the most glaring being the fact that Dhārāvarṣa reigned at Candrāvātī from 1163 to 1219 CE, more than one century after the consecration of Vimala's temple in 1031. It was his ancestor Dhandhuka who rebelled against the Caulukya king Bhīma and fled eastwards up to Dhārā, capital city of the Paramāra king Bhoja, as reported in an inscription from the Vimala temple dated 1322 CE, the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* and the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* (Choudhary 1963: 188-91; Chojnacki 1995a: 175).

jumps to the installation of the image and the fixing of a jar and a banner at the top of the temple,⁴⁴ but fortunately Ratnamandira retells the story with more details in the section of his *Upadeśataranṅiṇī* on temple stories. According to him, it is Pārśva himself who appears in a dream to the layman Pārasa and asks him to build a temple. When Pārasa objects that he has no money, Pārśva replies that there will be a lot of money through the transformation into gold of the rice grains offered in front of him.⁴⁵ Pārasa then sets out to erect the temple, and the work is already carried out on one side, when the layman is asked by his son about the provenance of the money. Pārasa tells him the story as it happened, but then the transformation into gold comes to an end, and as there is a shortage of funds, the temple remains in this state of construction.⁴⁶ An alternative story about the appearance of that holy place can be found in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, where a Prakrit prose narrative is specifically devoted to Phalavardhi. It states that once two merchants, Dhaṃdhala and Sivaṃkara, came to Phalavardhi and settled there. They found an image of Pārśva in a small shrine (*gabbhaghara-devaliā* ou *-deuliā*) buried in the ground, and they were told in a dream by the protecting deities to build a temple (*ceīa*). They started to do so with their own fortune but ran short of money. The deities once again told them in dream that every day an amount of money (*dammāṇaṃ satthiaṃ*) would appear before the image of Pārśva, and thanks to this intervention, the sacred complex is close to be completed until the day the merchants try to know how the money can appear. From this day on, the deities stopped giving money, in order to punish the laymen for their indiscretion.⁴⁷ The narrative thus leads to the same conclusion than in the first version: the temple remains unfinished.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ PPS 31. 9-15. This account probably derives from a more detailed version written in Prakrit, as suggested by the layman's name Pāsila, a diminutive of Pāsa, the Prakrit counterpart of Sanskrit Pārśva. Other versions of this legend can be found in Somadharma's *Upadeśasaptati* (II. 7. 5-28, pp. 37f.) and Śubhaśīlagani's *Prabandhapañcāśati* (cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 447).

⁴⁵ *svapne śrī-pārśvenoktam – mama prāsādaṃ kāraya mām arcaya pārśvena sva-dravyābhāve ucyaṃāne mad-agra-dhaukitāḥṣata-svarṇībhavanena dravyaṃ bahv api bhāvīti pratyayo darśitaḥ* | (UpTar 110. 4-6). In the *Upadeśasaptati*, Pārśva is replaced by a Vyantara god styled as the protecting deity of Pārśva's image (*bimbādhiṣṭhāyako'nyedur vyantaraḥ śreṣṭhi-puṅgavam* | *svapne jagāda prāsādaṃ svāminas tvaṃ vidhāpaya*, UpSap II. 7. 14, p. 38).

⁴⁶ *eka-pārśve maṇḍapādi sarvaṃ niṣpannaṃ tāvatā tat-putreṅgrhya drāvyāgama-svarūpe pṛṣṭe pārasena yathāvat kathite tat-survaṇī-bhavanaṃ sthitam* | *dravyābhāvāt prāsādas tāvān eva tasthau* | (UpTar 110. 6-7).

⁴⁷ Another reason is that the protecting deities know that the Mleccha rule is about to happen and somehow anticipate the degradations Jain temples will undergo then (cf. Chojnacki 1995b: 80).

⁴⁸ *paidiahaṃ pūyaṃti mahayā iddhīe te do vi | evaṃ pūjjaṃte bhuvanaṇāhe puṇo vi ahiṭṭhāyagehiṃ sumiṇe aiṭṭhaṃ tesiṃ jahā – tattheva paese ceīaṃ kāraṇeva tti | tao tehiṃ pahīṭṭha-cittehiṃ dohiṃ vi nia-vihavāṇusāreṇa ceīaṃ kāraṇeva aḍhattaṃ | payiṭṭā suttaḥārā kammaṭṭhāesu | jāva agga-maṇḍave nippanne tesiṃ appaḍḍhiatteṇa daviṇa-viccaṇaa-samatthayāe niatto kammaṭṭhāo | tao dhaṇiaṃ adhiimāvannā do vi paramovāsāyā | tayaṇaṃtaraṃ rayaṇīe puṇo vi ahiṭṭhāyaga-surehiṃ sumiṇe bhaṇiaṃ jahā – aippabhāe alavaṃtesu kāesu devassa agga dammāṇaṃ satthiaṃ paidiṇaṃ picchissaha | te dammā ceīa-kajje vaiyavva tti |*

Now, to give a third and last instance of such narratives of supernatural financing of temples, I will turn to the story of the Nemi temple of Kumbhariya as told with minor variations in three sources from the fifteenth century viz a late Prabandha included in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī* and the *Upadeśasaptati* of Somadharmā (1447).⁴⁹ According to these texts, there was in Ārāsaṇa (the former name of Kumbhariya)⁵⁰ a Jain layman called Pāsila who belonged to a prestigious family, as his father Goga had held the charge of minister, but who had lost all his wealth. He once came to the capital city of Pattana to do some business and visited the Rājavihāra temple recently built there by the king Jayasiṃha Siddharāja. Being particularly impressed by the monumental Jina image that was enshrined there, he pledged to build a similar temple in his own town in the presence of a wealthy Jain merchant's daughter.⁵¹ As he was broke, he propitiated the goddess Ambā by fasting ten days in order to get money from her. Ambā appeared and told him that he would get a sufficient quantity of precious metal from a neighbouring mine.⁵² However Pāsila eventually made Ambā angry by telling his spiritual master that the work was progressing well thanks to his favour. She deemed Pāsila ungrateful and put to an end the exploitation of the mine.⁵³ Pāsila had

tehiṃ taheva diṭṭhe te damme dhittūna sesa-kammaṭṭhāyaṃ kāraveum āḍhattaṃ | jāva paḍipuniṇā paṃca vi maṃḍavā ya lahu-maṃḍavā ya tihuṇa-jaṇa-citta-camukkārakkārae | bahu-nipannaṃmi cetaṃmi tesiṃ puttehiṃ ciṃtiaṃ - katto eaṃ davvaṃ saṃpajjai jaṃ aviccheṇa kammaṭṭhāyaṃ ussappai ti | aha ekaṃmi diṇe aippabhāe ceva thambhāiaṃtariā hoṇṇa nicuaṃ daṭṭhum āradhā | tammi divase devehiṃ na pūriaṃ dammāṇaṃ satthiaṃ | āsannaṃ ca miccha-rajjaṃ nāūṇa payatteṇa ārāhiā vi ahiṭṭhāyagā na pūriṃsu davvaṃ ti | ṭhio tad-avattho ceva ceā-kammaṭṭhāo | (VTK 105. 30 to 106. 8; tr. Chojnacki 1995a: 450f.). Jinaprabha says that the temple was consecrated by Dharmaghoṣasūri in 1181 VS (= 1124 CE), while the other sources gives the dates of 1199 VS (= 1142 CE) for the installation of the image and 1208 VS (1151 CE) or 1204 VS (1147 CE) for the installation of the flag-staff and the water-pot (cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 451 n. 20).

⁴⁹ PPS 30. 17 to 31. 7; UpTar pp. 107f.; UpSap p. 38-39, cf. Dhaky & Moorty 2001: 74-77.

⁵⁰ Dhaky and Moorty 2001: 33-35.

⁵¹ Hāṃsī or Bāi Hāṃsī by name, this young laywoman was the daughter of a man called Chāḍā, presented as a *ṭhakkura* and a *śreṣṭhin* in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* (PPS 30. 18, 30, 32) and as a *vyavahārin* or businessman possessing 90 or 99 lakhs of golden coins in the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī* and the *Upadeśasaptati* respectively (90 *lakṣa-hāṭakādhipa-vya°-chāḍā-putryā*, UpTar 108. 3-4; *nava-ghnaikādaśa-svarṇa-lakṣeṭ-chāḍā-tanuḷayā hāṃsī-nāṃnyā*, UpSap II. 8. 29-30, p. 39, cf. Dhaky and Moorty 2001: 75). Ratnamandira even specifies that Hāṃsī was “a young widow committed to the cult of gods” (*bāla-vidhava-deva-vandana-para-śrā[vikā]-hāṃsyā*).

⁵² According to Somadharmā, the mine produced silver, while Ratnamandira talks about gold. In the version given in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, it is not clear whether Pāsila extracted from it either metal or marble to be sold afterwards (cf. Dhaky & Moorty 2001: 76).

⁵³ That detail is missing in the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī*. In the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, the mine crumbles down, and in the third version, it is turned back into a lead mine.

nonetheless obtained 45 thousands golden *dīnāras* from the mine and was enabled to build at least a part of the shrine, which was thereafter completed by the young laywoman from Pattana at the cost of 9 lakhs of *drammas*.⁵⁴

3. The alchemy of divine protection and human piety

That supernatural beings should get involved in the process of creation and maintenance of a holy place is not unusual in Prabandha literature. As Phyllis Granoff put it in her 1992 article on Jain biographies of temple builders, “temple building and image making [...] involve a human devotee directly in the mysterious world of supernatural forces.”⁵⁵ What is perhaps more surprising in the three stories summarized above is that deities may appear to deprive the laymen or laywomen of the merit of building temples by providing themselves the required amount of money. Besides, it is striking that most of the time the beneficiaries of these divine favours eventually provoke the stopping of the building process by proving excessively curious or ungrateful towards the deity.

In my opinion, the crucial role played by divine beings in these stories can be explained by the fact that the holy places in question dramatically required a divine validation of their sanctity. It seems particularly clear in the case of Phalavardhi and Kumbhariya, since they emerged as religious centres at a relatively late date. Phalavardhi is conspicuously absent from ancient literature,⁵⁶ and the earliest temple of Kumbhariya dates back to the first half of the eleventh century.⁵⁷ On the other hand, the sanctity of Mount Abu was much more ancient, but being primarily a holy place of Hinduism, what was at stake in this case was the right of Jain people to have their own temple built there: this is why the initiative of Vimala is intertwined

⁵⁴ The three sources agree to state that she completed the main temple (consisting of a *mūlaprāsāda* and a *gūḍhamaṇḍapa*) by having a *meghanādamaṇḍapa* built in front of it – the *meghanādamaṇḍapa* being a particular type of *raṅgamaṇḍapa* having an attic storey (*tatra tayā śeṣaṃ sampūrṇaṃ kṛtaṃ | maṇḍapas tayā bhagiṇītvena kāritaḥ | lakṣa-9-dravya-lāgiḥ | sa ca meghanādaḥ | PPS 30. 33; meghanāda-maṇḍapo mārgitaḥ nava-lakṣa-dramma-vyayāt tayā kāritaḥ*, UpTar 108. 8; *vidhāyitaḥ maṇḍapo meghanādākhyo nava-lakṣa-vyayāt tayā*, UpSap II. 8. 41, p. 40; cf. Dhaky and Moorty 2001: 77 and plates 171, 174, 175).

⁵⁵ Granoff 1992: 309. “These accounts have little to do with wondrous events and miracles; lay temple builders become possessed and receive dream visions from deities that protect the Jain faith” (Granoff 1992: 303).

⁵⁶ Cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 393.

⁵⁷ Dhaky & Moorty 2001: 33-37.

with or even superseded by the story of the friendship between the goddesses Śrīmātā and Ambā.⁵⁸

This interpretation is further proven by the stress laid on the particular status of these deities as superintending gods or goddesses (*adhiṣṭhāyaka* or *adhiṣṭhātrī*): this is the case for the gods who are substituted to Pārśva in some versions of the Phalavardhi temple foundation,⁵⁹ and Ambikā is similarly styled as the superintending goddess of Kumbhariya in Ratnamandira's account.⁶⁰ In contrast, Ambā is not presented as the tutelary deity of Mount Abu, but in the *Prabandhakośa* version, she explicitly states that her friend Śrīmātā holds that position,⁶¹ and as such Śrīmātā can decide to share with Ambā her authority over the sacred mountain.⁶² It is

⁵⁸ According to Somadharmā, “the worshippers of Śrīmātā did not give their approbation to the temple, and said: ‘There has not been ever in the past any Jain temple, how could there be one here now?’ (*śrīmātā-pūjakāḥ kiṃtu na caityānumatiṃ daduḥ* || *purā kadāpi nātrābhūt śrījīnāyatanam khalu | tat sampraty api jainendraṃ caityam atra katham bhavet* || UpSap II. 4. 15-16, p. 33). Ambā then told Vimāla that a large image of Ṛṣabha had been deposited in the ground where the money was hidden, so that the priests when seeing it would be convinced of the antiquity of a Jain presence on Mount Abu. Whether the image was already there before was however a debated question, Somadharmā adds, and some very learned people opined that it had been brought by the goddess on purpose (*pratimāṃ tām ca ke'py āhus tatraiva prāg abhūd iyam | kecit tadaivānūteyaṃ devyety āhur bahuśrutāḥ* || UpSap II. 4. 19, p. 33). In contrast, the deities are no longer involved in the narratives retracing how two centuries later Vastupāla and Tejahpāla had the Lūṅigavasahī temple built close to the Vimalavasahī. They simply bought the plot of land from local authorities, the main one being the priest (*aboṭī*, *aboṭika* or *aboḍika*) of Śrīmātā's temple, the other one being, the lord of Candrāvātī, who held temporal power over Mount Abu (he is mentioned by Somadharmā and Ratnamandira). The *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* merely states that the brothers covered with *dramma* coins the plot of land they wanted to buy; Ratnamandira and Somadharmā corroborate the information and further add that the transaction amounted to 36 *mūṭaka* or *mūḍhaka* of *drammas* of the *vīśalapriya* type – or 62 lakhs, 10 thousands and 8 hundreds of coins according to the latter (*arbude śrīmātāboṭī-pārśvād vimalavasahikopari mūlyena bhūr grhītvā drammaid ācchādya* PPS 52. 32-33; *śrī-arbudācale śrīmātāboḍikasya candrāvātīśa-dhārāvarṣa-rāṇakasya ca pārśvāt vastupālena 36 mūḍhaka-vīśalapurī-drammaid bhūr ācchādyaśtārītā grhīta* | UpTar 115. 2-3; *tataḥ prastrṇatā tena drammaid bhuvī kaṇān iva | ṣaṭ-triṃśan-mūṭakāś teṣāṃ tatra prasārītāḥ kṣaṇāt* || *dvāṣaṣṭi-lakṣa-dvi-paṅkti-sahasrāṣṭa-śata-pramāḥ | atra drammaid syur āśritya vīśalapriya-nāṇakaṃ* || UpSap II. 5. 11-12). The word *mūḍhaka* which alternates in texts and inscriptions with *mūḍā* and *mūṭaka* refers to a measure of capacity equal to 24, 50 or 100 maunds (cf. Sandesara & Thaker 1962: 30, 84, 184; Sircar 1966: 204, 207). The expression *vīśalapurīdramma* is a variant of *vīśalapriyadramma*, itself an abbreviation of *vīśalapriyadramma*, a coin from the mint of the merchant Vīśala, also known as Vīśvamalla (Sircar 1966: 135, 376, 433, 442). In the same way the *bhīmapriyadramma* or *drāma* type of coin is shortened to *bhīmapri*^o or *bhīmapurī*^o in the texts (Sandesara & Thaker 1962: 174). For the term *aboṭika*, see Sandesara & Thaker 1962: 43, 105.

⁵⁹ See the quotations from the *Upadeśasaptati* and the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* n. 45, 48.

⁶⁰ *tadanu daśopavāsair ambikā ārādhitā ārāsaṇādhiṣṭhātrī* | (UpTar 108. 5).

⁶¹ *param kṣaṇam pratikṣasva | yāvatāham giri-varārbudādhiṣṭhātrīyāḥ sakhyaḥ śrīmātur matam grhṇāmi* | (PK 121. 24-25)

⁶² Ratnamandira stresses that the presence of a Jain sanctuary on Mount Abu is definitely sanctioned by the consecration of an image of the Jain goddess which has miraculously appeared there: “An image of Ambikā came out of the ground and was installed in the monastery along with the Kṣetrapāla Khañja, indicating plainly to the

also worth noting that in the second part of the story as told in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* and the *Upadeśataranṅinī*, the erection of Vimala’s temple is delayed because of the presence under the ground of a Nāga named Vālīnāha, the owner of the land,⁶³ who destroys every night what has been constructed during the day. According to the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, Ambā gives advice to Vimala either to conciliate the Nāga with suitable offerings or to make him leave the place if he asks for wine or other inappropriate items. When he sees Vimala drawing his sword, the frightened Nāga takes to flight with loud cries, and a Jain Kṣetrapāla takes his place.⁶⁴ Interestingly enough, the texts dealing with the foundation of the Lūṅigavasahī temple on Mount Abu two centuries later merely involve human agents, as it is no longer necessary to justify a Jain presence in the same terms there.

If the deities are credited with financing the erection of temples in order to enhance the sanctity of the holy place, it should not be concluded that the laymen are totally deprived of any merit. On the contrary, it is the purity of their conduct that seems to lie at the root of the whole process of temple building. For instance, all the versions of the foundation of the Nemi temple of Kumbhariya make it clear that Pāsila obtained money from Ambā by fasting for ten days.

followers of other creeds that there was a Jain sanctuary on the holy Mount Abu and so on” (*bhūmer nirgatā śrī-arbudācala-jina-tīrtham ityādi paradarśaninām saṃsūcīkāmbikā khañja-kṣetrapāla-yutā maṭhe sthāpitā* | UpTar p. 112 l. 12).

⁶³ *tasya bhūr iyam* (PPS 52. 15-16); *bhūmi-netā vālīnāha-nāga* (UpTar 112. 8).

⁶⁴ *tathākṛte sa ārāṭim kṛtvā pranaṣṭaḥ* | *tatra devakulyāṃ kṣetrapālaḥ sthāpitaḥ* | (PPS 52. 18-19; for the meaning of the word *ārāṭi* cf. Sandesara and Thaker 1962: 108-109). According to Ratnamandira, it seems that the Nāga himself is made the Kṣetrapāla of the holy place by Ambā (*vālīnāho naṣṭo’mbā-vacanena kṣetrapālībhūya sthītaḥ* | UpTar 112. 7-10). Somadharma is more explicit: the Nāga “is unable to bear a Jain temple because he is spoiled by a wrong faith” (*mithyātva-dūṣito jaina-prāsādam sa na sāsahīḥ*) but “once appeased by the speech of Ambā, he adopts the right faith and becomes the Kṣetrapāla of that place” (*ambā-vacasā copasāntik-bhāk samyaktvaṃ prāpya tatraiva kṣetrapālo babhūva ca*, UpSap II. 4. 22-27, p. 33). According to another version reported by Jayantavijaya, “the Vyantara [Vālīnāha] overpowered by the unprecedented valour and merits of the great minister, was completely subdued, and accepting the offerings, went away pacified” (Jayantavijaya 1954: 28-29, n. 3). The motif of the Nāga appears at the end of the story of Śrīmātā as told in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* and the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*: her father Śrīpuñja had a temple built on Mount Abu in her honour, but six months later, a Nāga called Arbuda settled under the mountain, and as he makes it tremble every time he moves, all the temples built there are deprived of spire (*śikhara*) (*yataḥ ṣaṇmāsante tasya girer adho-bhāga-varttī arbuda-nāmā nāgo yadā calati tadā parvata-kampo bhavati* | *ataḥ śikhara-rahitās tatra sarve’pi prāsādāḥ* | PCi 110. 30-31, tr. Tawney 1991: 179; *ṣaṇ-māsante’rbudākhyo’syādhobhāge’dreś calaty ahiḥ* | *tato’dri-kampas tat sarve prāsādāḥ śikharam vinā* || 24 ||, VTK 15. 25, tr. Cort 1993: 259; Chojnacki 1995a: 170f.). According to non-Jain traditions, Jinaprabha adds, the original name of the mountain was Nandivardhana but it came to be called Arbuda because the Nāga Arbuda stayed there. As a matter of fact it is said in the *Skandapurāṇa* that Nandivardhana was entrusted by his father Himālaya with the task of filling a dangerous chasm created by Indra’s thunderbolt, and that the mountain came there on the back of the Nāga Arbuda. The Nāgas also sought refuge on the mountain at the time of the snake sacrifice ordered by king Janamejaya (Jayantavijaya 1954: 3-4, cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 171 n. 14). The opposition of non-Jain deities to the building of a Jain temple is a typical motif (cf. Granoff 1992: 308).

Similarly, the two merchants who were entrusted with the task of building the Pārśva temple of Phalavardhi according to the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* are presented at the outset as members of prestigious Jain families endowed with outstanding qualities:

“Among these merchants, a great layman named Dhaṃdhala stood out, who was the pearl of the Shrimal lineage and the leader of a community of pious people. There was another one with similar qualities, Sivaṃkara, a moon in the sky of the Oswal lineage.”⁶⁵

And in the alternative foundation story reported in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha* and the *Upadeśataranṅiṇī*, it is even more blatant that money is obtained through acts of piety, since Pārśva turns into gold these very grains of rice that the layman Pārasa has left in front of his image. As for the minister Vimāla, whose very name already proclaims his outstanding purity, Jinaprabha states in the Kalpa on Mount Abu that he had a pure mind (*vimalāṃ buddhiṃ*), and, with the exception of the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, all the sources indicate that when Ambā told him he could get only one single favour from her, Vimāla gave up his desire to have sons and asked for a piece of land to build a temple there.⁶⁶ Thus he deserved to be financially supported in his pious project of temple building. In other terms, the acquisition of wealth is to be understood in any case as the consequence of an accurate religious practice, as it is exemplified by the story of Dhanada which opens the anonymous *Kathākośa* from the eleventh century and concludes the *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi*. Dhanada was a rich Jain layman who at the apex of his prosperity had a temple built in his city, but who lost thereafter all his wealth and had to move to a small village. However, he did not give up his faith and eventually returned to his own temple, where he duly worshipped the Jina with a garland of flowers. As a reward for such devotion, the Yakṣa Kapardin gave back his wealth to Dhanada by depositing in the four corners of his house four jars filled with gold.⁶⁷

The mention of these jars may remind us of the similar jar unearthed by Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla in the first anecdote about the brothers’ life that Rājeśekhara gives in the *Prabandhakośa*, and suggests that even though no deity is mentioned there, that discovery is to

⁶⁵ *tesu vi ego siri-sirimāla-vaṃsa-muttāmaṇī dhammia-loa-gāma-gāmaṇī dhaṃdhalo nāma parama-sāvao hutthā | bīo a tārisa-guṇo ceva uvaesavāla-kula-nahayala-nisākaro sivaṃkaro nāma |* (VTK 105. 20-21, cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 449).

⁶⁶ Chojnacki 1995a: 174.

⁶⁷ *tasya sādharmaikatvāt kapardi-yakṣeṇaitad-grhe caturṣu grha-koṇikeṣu suvarṇa-pūrṇāṃś caturaḥ kalaśān nidhīkṛtyādrśyatvam āgataḥ* (*Kathākośa*, p. 3); *kiṃ tu kapardi-yakṣas tasya sādharmaikyātulya-vatsalya-sambandhe tad-dhāmi caturṣu koṇeṣu suvarṇa-pūrṇān caturaḥ kalaśān nidhīkṛtya tirodadhe* (PCi 124. 7-9).

be understood as the fruit of the brothers' good conduct.⁶⁸ Besides, it is noteworthy that the second anecdote of their biography relates how they were appointed by Vīradhavalā to the charge of ministers at the instigation of Maḥaṇadevī, the tutelary deity (*adhiṣṭhātrī*) of Gujarat.⁶⁹ Given that the brothers suffered from poverty in their childhood according to several Prabandhas, it looks like they were raised to the position of wealthy and influent laymen by some deity as well, and as a consequence the amounts of money they spent on temple building can also be traced back to personal merit and divine protection altogether.⁷⁰

In other terms, there is literally a very subtle alchemy at the origin of the process of temple building, that requires not only a close cooperation between a proactive deity and a meritorious man, but also several other ingredients, the most evident one being some low metal that could be changed into silver or gold.⁷¹ Sometimes the substance which is literally or symbolically

⁶⁸ As a matter of fact, it is explicitly presented as the consequence of "Vastupāla's good fortune" (*vastupāla-saubhāgyena*) in the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī* (see above n. 38). Similarly, the goddess Ambā manifests herself to the layman Pāsila because of his "good fortune" in Somadharmā's version of the foundation of the Nemi temple at Khumbhariya (*ārarādha tato'mbāṃ sa gurūktāmnāya-pūrvakam | daśopavāsaiḥ pratyakṣā sāpy abhūd asya bhāgyatāh* || UpSap II. 8. 33, p. 39)

⁶⁹ PK 101. 14-15. Maḥaṇadevī reappears later in the *Prabandhakośa*, when Gujarat is attacked by the Sultan of Delhi. Invoked by Vastupāla, she manifests herself "because of his good luck" (*tat-bhāgyāt*) and tells him which strategy will lead him to victory (PK 117. 20-23, cf. Khatavate 1961: 57 n. 3). In the *Kīrtikaumudī*, the court poet Someśvara had already linked the appointment of the brothers as ministers with the intervention of Gūrjaralakṣmī, the tutelary goddess of Gujarat, though not in such a direct way. According to him, she appeared in a dream to the prince Lavaṇaprasāda and threw a garland around his neck. As Lavaṇaprasāda's spiritual teacher told him this dream foretells his rise as the ruler of Gujarat, the prince looked for able ministers and chose Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla. Someśvara's contemporary Arisimha invoked another supernatural being in the *Sukṛtasamkīrtana*, the late king Kumārapāla who had become a god thanks to his faith in Jain doctrine. Kumārapāla appeared in a dream to his descendant king Bhīma II and enjoined him to make Lavaṇaprasāda's son Vīradhavalā heir to the throne (*yuvārāja*). Bhīma did so as soon as he woke up, and Vīradhavalā then appointed the brothers as ministers (cf. Khatavate 1961: 50; Bühler 1902: 483-86; Choudhary 1963: 303).

⁷⁰ Even Jāvaḍi, the archetype of the temple building and renovating Jain layman, becomes a millionaire thanks to a divine being, Kapardin, whose knowledge of future helps him to speculate successfully. With the profit he makes, Jāvaḍi is able to have a miraculous image brought from Gajjanaka to Śatruṅjaya for a sum of 9 lakhs of gold, and he spends 10 more lakhs for having it installed (Granoff 1992: 306). In the *Prabandhakośa*, one comes across the story of the merchant Lalla, who undertakes to build a Jain temple at the instigation of his spiritual master the monk Jīvadeva. Once the temple is built, Lalla learns from an ascetic that it will be haunted by the ghost of some woman. He informs his teacher of that, and the latter then replies: "You must rid the spot of that offending ghost and then rebuild the temple. Lalla! Do not worry about where the money will come from. The Goddesses whose task it is to look after the temple will provide all the money that you will need" (*niḥśalyāṃ bhūmiṃ kṛtvā punaḥ prāsādaḥ kāryate | lalla tvayā dravya-cintā na kāryā | tad-adhiṣṭhātrīyo dhanam pūrayiṣyanti* | PK 8. 30-31, tr. Granoff 1993: 151-53; cf. also Granoff 1992: 316).

⁷¹ This is the case in the story of the Nemi temple of Kumbhariya as told by Somadharmā: by her power the goddess Ambā makes a lead (*sīsaka*) mine produce silver (*rūpya*) to the benefit of the layman Pāsila (*mamānubhāvāt te bhāvī rūpya-kṛt sīsakākāraḥ*, UpSap II. 8. 34, p. 39, cf. Dhaky and Moorty 2001: 75). Sometimes the alchemists also consider whether the soil itself is of an auspicious type and can be used as the base for the alchemical process

transmuted is a pious gift, like the grains of rice Pārāsa presents the image of Pārśva with, or the milk spontaneously offered by a cow to the buried image of Pārśva.⁷² The narratives also frequently mention the presence of a particular kind of tree; admittedly it can merely serve as a mere landmark to locate the treasure,⁷³ but the tree may also reveal the presence of a treasure underground by an alteration of its natural characteristics (for instance its branches may bend downwards as if attracted by the treasure).⁷⁴ Besides, in an esoteric context, a tree or a plant may also provide a natural sap of some use to provoke the alchemical reaction. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, Hemacandra remembers a scene from his childhood when his master Devacandra changed a lump of copper into gold by smearing it with the sap of some creeper and applying fire to it, and that is why he shows a strong interest in knowing about the name and characteristics of that creeper.⁷⁵

(cf. Chojnacki 2008b: 555). Here can be seen the proximity between the alchemical science and the art of treasure hunt, which also consists in localizing and extracting riches from the ground (cf. Balbir 1993: 22f.).

⁷² As for the Vimalavasahī temple, the ground on which it is to be erected is auspiciously marked with cowdung in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* and the *Upadeśataraṅgiṇī* (see above n. 40, 43). The saffron colour of the cowdung in Ratnamandira's version may be indicative of the presence of gold underground, as the colour of a tree's sap is also supposed to reveal which kind of precious material the soil contains (Balbir 1993: 39).

⁷³ In the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, for instance, a merchant has chosen a small tree as a mark (*upalakṣaṇa*) in order to recognize the place where he has buried his *dīnāras* (*Kathāsaritsāgara* 6.7.144-145, cf. Balbir 1993: 18).

⁷⁴ Balbir 1993: 16-18, 27, 29. Admittedly, none of the varieties of trees mentions in the Prabandhas (*campaka*, *bakula*, and the jujube tree, *bori* or *badarī* in the Kalpa of Phalavardhi cf. Chojnacki 1995a: 449) appears in the didactic passages from the Jain narratives examined by Nalini Balbir, which all show a strong preference for the *bilva* and the *palāśa*. But the stray mentions here of a coconut tree, there of a *pomāḍa* tree suggest that other species than these two ones could mark the presence of an underground treasure as well (Balbir 1993: 35-36; Chojnacki 2008b: 326 n. 1052).

⁷⁵ *mama bālye varṭtamānasya tāmra-khaṇḍaṃ kāṣṭha-bhāra-vāhakāt yācīta-vallī-rasenābhṛyuktaṃ yuṣmad-ādeśād vahni-saṃyogāt suvarṇābhūva | tasyā valler nāma-saṅketādir ādiśyatām |* (PCi 93. 20-22). For the ambiguity of the word *rasa*, which is synonymous with *pārada* “mercury” but also refers to various types of liquid like the “sap” of a plant here, see Chojnacki 2000: 148 n. 39, 156-58.

Temples	Deities	Laymen	Substances	Trees
Vimalavasahī of Abu	Ambā	Vimala	earth marked with cowdung (VTK, UpTar)	<i>campaka</i> (VTK, UpSap) <i>campaka</i> and <i>bakula</i> (PPS, UpTar)
Pārśva temple of Phalavardhi	Pārśva (PPS, UpTar) Vyantara god (UpSap)	Pārāsa	clod (PPS, UpSap) grains of rice (all)	<i>jāli-vana</i> (PPS)
	superintending gods (VTK)	Dhaṃdhala and Sivaṃkara	cow milk	<i>bori-taru</i>
Nemi temple of Kumbhariya	Ambikā (as superintending goddess in UpTar)	Pāsila	lead (UpSap)	
Temples of Girnar, Śatruñjaya and other sacred mountains		Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla	copper jar (PK) silver coins and copper jars (UpTar)	<i>aśvattha</i> (PK) <i>śamī</i> (UpTar)

As for Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla, they directly find in the ground a treasure of gold, but several details of the story also suggest that it results from a kind of alchemical process. Besides the fact that the discovery takes place in the mysterious setting of night,⁷⁶ it must be noted that the spot where the brothers have the ground dug up is situated at the base of a tree. Of course, as Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla come there for burying a part of their fortune, the tree can be intended to help them find back later the hiding place, but two other details strengthen the hypothesis of some alchemical reaction. One is precisely the fact that the brothers bring with them one third of their fortune which according to Ratnamandira consists of silver coins stored in copper jars. In others words, they bring with them a quantity of metal that can be transmuted into gold. And if Rājaśekhara does not say precisely neither under which form or in which containers their money is brought to the spot, he nonetheless mentions copper as the material

⁷⁶ Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla obviously wait for the night to go bury their money in order to keep it secret, but night is also in favour with alchemists and treasure hunters, the former needing some tranquillity to do their manipulations and the latter being helped in their quest by the glow the earth or the plants are supposed to shed when they shelter a treasure (Balbir 1993: 37).

of the ancient jar containing the golden treasure, and as a matter of fact, one Kalpa from Jinaprabha's collection shows that copper was the most suitable metal for transmutation.⁷⁷ The other detail of importance is the type of tree mentioned, a fig tree in the *Prabandhakośa* and a mimosa in the *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī*. Admittedly, the fig tree is a very bad sign in the context of a treasure hunt like any tree bearing latex,⁷⁸ but the fact that it is replaced with a mimosa in a later rewriting reminds of the esoteric association of these two trees in the famous Vedic myth of Purūravas as told in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, and in the same way as a fire obtained by rubbing one piece of mimosa and one piece of fig tree together (or two pieces of fig tree) can afford immortality,⁷⁹ the presence of either of these trees could be of some use to make the alchemical process succeed.

Yet it appears from several stories that among all the ingredients required by the alchemic science, the merit of the human agent is the most important one, since such an activity cannot be undertaken successfully unless he is endowed with the required qualities,⁸⁰ or fails as soon as he makes the slightest fault of moral conduct. The first situation is exemplified by the way the teacher Devacandra explains to Kumārapāla why he refuses to impart his knowledge of alchemy to him: “You have not that good fortune which would enable you to acquire the science of producing gold in such a way as to free the whole world from debt.”⁸¹ As for the moral fault that puts to an end the miraculous financing of the temple building, it appears systematically in the different narratives about the Pārśva temple of Phalodhi and the Nemi temple of Kumbhariya, and even though it may have been intended to explain why the temples were unfinished, the motif had nonetheless a strong moral relevance, urging the audience not to deviate anytime from the path or right conduct.

Lastly, the fact that in the texts under review money issues become the responsibility of deities while laymen involved in the process of temple building just have to behave piously also

⁷⁷ In the *Ujjayantakalpa*, fourth Kalpa of the collection dedicated to Mount Girnar and characterised by the omnipresence of alchemy, copper ranks first among the transmuted metals with six mentions, before tin (two mentions) and silver (one mention) (cf. Chojnacki 2000: 157). There is in Siddharṣi's *Upamitibhāva-prapañcakathā* another example of a treasure of 1,000 *dīnāras* contained in a copper jar (cf. Balbir 1993: 37).

⁷⁸ Balbir 1993: 33f.; Chojnacki 2008b: 326 n. 1051.

⁷⁹ *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, XI. 5. 1, cf. Patton 1993: 8.

⁸⁰ In Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā*, the prince Kuvalayacandra, on his way back to Ayodhyā, meets in the Vindhya mountains with a group of alchemists whose attempts at producing gold fail despite their observance of the rules. Understanding that the two only things they lack are virtue and divine protection, the prince invokes the Jinās and the Siddhas while preparing the transmutation and eventually succeeds (cf. Chojnacki 2008b: 551-58).

⁸¹ *etad bhāgyam bhavato nāsti yena jagad-āṅṅya-kāriṇī hema-niṣpatti-vidyā tava siddhyati* | (PCi 93. 24-25, trad. Tawney 1991: 148). As for Hemacandra, Devacandra thinks he is not clever enough to acquire this knowledge.

points to another kind of alchemical operation: in all likelihood, the temples were financed by the prominent members of the community thanks to their lucrative activities, but it looks like by the magic of literature material wealth was turned into pure merit, and rich patrons into humble devotees. What these anecdotes are meant to celebrate is not how much wealth these laymen – and laywomen – possessed, but how piously they behaved while acquiring or spending it. The name of Hāmsī was thus remembered, and Tejaḥpāla’s wife Anupamadevī as well found a reward for her generosity in the laudatory words of Jain teachers:

“Fortune is fickle, Śivā is wrathful, Śacī is disgraced by having many rivals, Gaṅgā is always on the descent, Sarasvatī is all made of words, therefore Anupamā is unequalled.”⁸²

It may even be surmised that the earlier chroniclers intended to celebrate this alchemical virtue of literature when they made an exception and gave the exact amounts of money the patrons lavished on poets:⁸³ as a matter of fact, the poetic compositions from those times became an immaterial treasure that has survived through the ages even more effectively than the architectural monuments.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Kathākośa. Edited and Translated into German by Ingeborg Hoffman. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. München, 1974.

Kīrtikaumudī of Someśvaradeva. *Two Panegyric and Historical Poems Describing the Good Deeds of the Great Minister Vastupal of Gujarat*, 1-42. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1961.

PCi = *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha, 1933 (SJS 1).

PK = *Prabandhakośa* of Rājaśekhara. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha, 1935 (SJS 6).

⁸² *lakṣmīś calā śivā caṇḍī śacī sāpatnya-dūṣitā | gaṅgā nyāg-gāminī vāṇī vāk sārānupamā tataḥ || ityādibhiḥ stutibhir jainācāryaiḥ stūyate sma |* (PCi 104. 11-12; tr. Tawney 1991: 165).

⁸³ See above n. 14.

PPS = *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Calcutta: Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha, 1936 (SJS 2).

Sukṛtasamkīrtana of Arisimha. *Two Panegyric and Historical Poems Describing the Good Deeds of the Great Minister Vastupal of Gujarat*, Appendix 2, 95-136. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1961.

UpSap = *Upadeśasaptati* of Paṇḍit Somadharmagaṇi, Edited by Caturvijayamuni. Bhavnagar: Jain Atmananda Sabha, 1915 (Vīra Saṃvat 2441) (Atmananda Grantharatnamala 33).

UpTar = *Upadeśatarāṅgiṇī* of Ratnamandira. Printed and Published by Harṣacandra, son of Śreṣṭhi Bhūrabhāi. Banaras: Dharmabhyudaya Press, 1911 (Vīra Saṃvat 2437) (Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā 26).

VTK = *Vividhatīrthakalpa*. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha, 1934 (SJS 10).

Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra. Text and English Translation by Olle Qvarnström. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University (Harvard Oriental Series 61), 2002.

Secondary Sources

Balbir, Nalini. “A la recherche des trésors souterrains.” *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 3 (1993) 15-55.

Bühler, Georg. “The Sukritasamkirtana of Arisimha.” *Indian Antiquary* 31 (1902) 477-495.

Chojnacki, Christine. *Vividhatīrthakalpaḥ. Regards sur le lieu saint jaina*. 2 Volumes. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry / Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1995.

Chojnacki, Christine. “Monts sacrés et alchimie jaina au Moyen Âge. L’*Ujjayantakalpa* de Jinaprabhasūri (XIV^e s.)” *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*. Herausgegeben von Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann & Volker M. Tschannerl, 139-172. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 2000.

Chojnacki, Christine. *Kuvalayamālā. Roman jaina de 779 composé par Uddyotanasūri*. 2 Volumes. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, 2008.

Chojnacki, Christine. “On Generous Donors, Precious Books. The Cost of Financing Long Jain Manuscripts in Western India 11th–14th Centuries.” *Carusri Essays In Honour Of Svastisri Charukirti Bhattaraka Pattacharya*. Edited by Hampa Nagarajaiah & Jayandra Soni, 25-44. Bangalore: Sapna Book House, 2019.

Choudhary, Gulab Chandra. *Political History of Northern India from Jain Sources (C. 650 A.D. to 1300 A.D.)*. Amritsar: Sohanlal Jaindharma Pracharak Samiti, 1963.

Cort, John E. "Twelve Chapters from the Guidebook to Various Pilgrimage Places: The *Vividhatīrthakalpa* of Jinaprabhasūri." *The Clever Adultrous and Other Stories*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 245-290. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1993.

Cort, John E. "Devotion at Home, Devotion in the Temple: Patterns of Jain Worship." *Puja and Piety: Hindu, Jain, and Buddhist Art from the Indian Subcontinent*. Edited by Pratapaditya Pal, 89-115. Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Museum of Art / University of California Press, 2016.

Dhaky, M. A. & U. S. Moorty. *The Temples in Kumbhāriyā*. New Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies / Ahmedabad: Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Institute of Indology, 2001.

Granoff, Phyllis. "The Householder as Shaman. Jain Biographies of Temple Builders." *East and West* 42, 2/4 (1992) 301-317.

Granoff, Phyllis. "Jain Biographies: Selections from the *Prabandhakośa*, *Kharatara-gacchabhṛhadgurvāvali*, *Vṛddhācāryaprabandhāvali* and the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*." *The Clever Adultrous and Other Stories*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 140-181. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1993.

Jayantavijaya Muni. *Holy Abu*. Translated from Gujarati with an Introduction by Umakant Premanand Shah. Bhavnagar: Shri Yashovijaya Jaina Granthamala, 1954.

Johnson, Helen M. *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra or the Lives of Sixty-Three Illustrious Persons by Ācārya Śrī Hemacandra*, vol. VI. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1962.

Khatavate, A. V. "Introduction to the First Edition of *Kīrtikaumudī*." *Two Panegyric and Historical Poems Describing the Good Deeds of the Great Minister Vastupal of Gujarat*, Appendix 1, 43-59. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1961.

Laughlin, Jack. "Portraiture and Jain Sacred Place: The Patronage of the Ministers Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla." *Pilgrims, Patrons and Place: Localizing Sanctity in Asian Religions*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff & Koichi Shinohara, 297-331. Vancouver / Toronto, UBC Press, 2003.

Leclère, Basile. "Architectural Science in Jain Poetry. The Description of Kumārapāla's Temple." *International Journal of Jaina Studies (Online)* 13, 4 (2017) 1-30.

Lüders, Heinrich. "Jaina Inscriptions at the Temple of Neminātha on Mount Abu." *Epigraphia Indica* 8 (1905-1906) 200-229.

Patton, Laurie L. "The Transparent Text: Purāṇic Trends in the Bṛhaddevatā." *Purāṇa Perennis. Reciprocity and Transformation in Hindu and Jaina Texts*. Edited by Wendy Doniger, 3-30. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Sandesara, Bhogilal J. *Literary Circle of Mahāmātya Vastupāla and its Contribution to Sanskrit Literature*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1953.

Sandesara, Bhogilal J. & Jayant P. Thaker. *Lexicographical Studies in 'Jain Sanskrit'*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1962.

Sircar, D. C. *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966.

Sircar, D. C. *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization. From the Sixth Century B.C. to the Sixth Century A.D.* Second Revised and Enlarged Edition. Volume 2. Calcutta, 1983.

Tawney, C.H. *The Kathākośa or Treasury of Stories*. Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1975 (1st Edition, London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1895)

Tawney, C. H. *The Prabandhacintamani*. Delhi: A. Sagar Book House, 1991 (1st Edition, Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1899).

Williams, Robert. *Jaina Yoga*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.