

ARCHITECTURAL SCIENCE IN JAIN POETRY THE DESCRIPTIONS OF KUMARAPALA'S TEMPLES

Basile Leclère

1. Introduction

In the fourth act of the *Moharājaparājaya* or *Defeat of King Delusion*, a play about the conversion to Jainism of the Caulukya king Kumārapāla (r. 1143-1173) written by the Jain layman Yaśaḥpāla under the reign of Kumārapāla's successor Ajayapāla (r. 1173-1176), there is a scene wherein several allegorical characters, Prince Gambling, his wife Falsehood and his friends Venison and Excellent-Wine are suddenly informed by a royal proclamation that a Jain festival is about to take place. Understanding that their existence is threatened by the king's commitment to the ethics of Jainism, all these vices look in panic for a place in the capital city of Aṇahillapura (modern Patan) to take refuge in. Falsehood then points at a great temple where she thinks they could revel, but she learns from her husband that it is a Jain sanctuary totally unfit for welcoming them, as well as the many other charming temples that Falsehood notices in the vicinity. Prince Gambling and Excellent-Wine then explain that all these temples have been built by Kumārapāla under the influence of his spiritual teacher, the Jain monk Hemacandra.¹ As a matter of fact, Kumārapāla did launch an ambitious architectural project after converting to Jainism and had Jain temples built all over the Caulukya empire, a feat celebrated by another allegorical character, Right-Judgement, in the fifth act of the *Defeat of King Delusion*: there he expresses his joy of seeing the earth looking like a woman thrilled with joy, with all these temples to Dispassionate Jinas erected at a high level as the hair of a body.²

Other Jain writers from the times of Kumārapāla similarly praised the king's decision to manifest the social and political rise of Jainism by filling the landscape with so many temples. When the king was still alive, Hemacandra himself, when writing the life of Mahāvīra, made the last Jina predict that Kumārapāla would adorn the earth with temples of Jina in almost every village.³ And in 1185, that is twelve years after his death, the king in

¹ MRP IV. 19+, tr. Leclère 2013: 489f.

² *uccaiḥ-kārita-vītarāga-bhavana-vyājena romāñcitāṃ ... kṣamā-yoṣitaṃ* (MRP V. 15).

³ *sa prāyeṇa pratigrāmam api niḥśīma-vaibhavaḥ | kariṣyati mahīm etāṃ jināyatana-maṇḍitāṃ ||*

person appears in a Prakrit work by Somaprabha, the *Kumārapālapratibodha* or *Awakening of Kumārapāla*, to proclaim his decision to have all these temples built:

Now that I have understood the true nature of God, I feel a state of happiness rising inside of me, and I will order the construction of temples of Tīrthaṅkaras everywhere.⁴

The information is confirmed later on by the authors of Jain chronicles: Prabhācandra says that Kumārapāla “had Jain sanctuaries built by other people in every place of the country”⁵ and Merutuṅga that “he caused 1440 temples to be built in various places.”⁶ The latter writer also tells us that, unfortunately, most of these temples were destroyed soon after the demise of Kumārapāla, by decision of his successor Ajayapāla, with the exception of the Ajitanātha temple of Tāraṅgadurga (modern Taranga),⁷ which has indeed survived up to the present day.

Some of these temples were given particular names in relation to the alleged motive of their foundation: in order to expiate the death of a mouse he was responsible for in his youth, Kumārapāla thus had the Mūṣakavihāra or Mouse Temple erected, and as a token of his gratitude towards a merchant’s daughter-in-law who gave him food when he was a hungry wanderer, he founded the Karambakavihāra or Ground Rice Temple in Aṇahillapura.⁸ Kumārapāla also dedicated at least two temples to the memory of his father Tribhuvanapāla, one in Vāgbhaṭapura near the sacred complex of Mount Śatruñjaya,⁹ the other one in the

(TŚPC X. 12. 75, quoted in KCS p. 138, tr. Johnson vol. VI, p. 311).

⁴ *sampai devassarūvaṃ muṇiūṇā samullasaṃtasuhabhāvo | titthayara-maṃdirāiṃ savvatha vi kāravissāmi ||* (KPrat, p. 144, quoted in KCS p. 121)

⁵ PCa XXII. 687, quoted and translated below.

⁶ *teṣu teṣu ca deṣeṣu catvāriṃśad-adhikāni catur-daśa-śatāni vihārāṇāṃ kārayāṃ āsa* (PCi 86. 11; Tawney 1991: 133). Tawney indicates that the number is 1444 in one manuscript. According to the *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha*, the total number of temples founded by Kumārapāla was 1400 (*catur-daśa-śatī-saṃkhyān vihārāṃs* cf. KCS p. 111). Elsewhere in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, the Jain monk Devacandra observes that Kumārapāla has done many meritorious acts, such as “forbidding the killing of living creatures and adorning the earth with images of the Jinas” (*māri-nivāraṇa-jina-maṇḍita-pṛthvī-karaṇādibhiḥ puṇyairiḥ*, PCi 93. 25-26; Tawney 1991: 148).

⁷ PCi 96. 8-14; Tawney 1991: 151.

⁸ PCi 91. 1-5; Tawney 1991: 142f. The stories of the mouse and the merchant’s daughter-in-law are told by Merutuṅga at the beginning of Kumārapāla’s biography (PCi 77. 23-27; Tawney 1991: 117). A third story of temple foundation associated in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* with the two previous ones concerns the Yukāvihāra or Louse Temple: it is said to have been erected by Kumārapāla in the memory of a louse crushed by a rich man despite the royal decree forbidding the killing of living creatures.

⁹ *śrī-bāhadapure nṛpati-pitur nāmnā śrī-tribhuvanapālavihāre śrī-pārśvanāthaṃ sthāpitavān |* (PCi 87. 15-16; Tawney 1991: 135f.). The same sentence appears in the *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* (KCS p. 101).

capital city. There were also in Patan twenty-four other temples built for the twenty-four Tīrthankaras, the names of which are unknown to us, with the exception of the Trivihāra, possibly a triple-shrined temple according to an architectural formula specific to Jain architecture.¹⁰ However most of these temples were called Kumāravihāra after the king's own name and, besides the Kumāravihāra of Taranga, we have textual or inscriptional testimonies to the existence of Kumāravihāra in more or less important cities of the Caulukya empire, such as Stambhatīrtha,¹¹ Someśvarapaṭṭana,¹² Thārāpadra,¹³ Jābālipura,¹⁴ but the best documented one is of course the Kumāravihāra of the capital city: beside being described by Somaprabha and Yaśaḥpāla, this monument was dedicated a whole poem by two Jain monks who frequented Kumārapāla's court: Vardhamāna wrote a *Kumāravihāraprasasti* or *Eulogy of the Kumāravihāra*,¹⁵ and Rāmacandra composed a *Kumāravihārasataka* or *Century on the Kumāravihāra*. As regards their plan and shape, these temples belonged to a particular architectural style of the Nāgara type of temple known as Maru-Gurjara, which appeared and flourished in North-Western India from the late tenth century onwards.¹⁶ What characterises the Jain interpretation of this style has been determined by the specialists of Western Indian architecture through an observation of the surviving monuments and an investigation of the extant textual sources: in an article on "The Western Indian Jaina Temple", the late brilliant scholar M. A. Dhaky thus established a list of twenty chief constituent parts of Jain temples from these period and area that he named in conformity to medieval sources from Gujarat and Rajasthan.¹⁷ Yet it must be noted that, excepting two fragmentary manuals on architecture, the *Vāstusāstra* (late eleventh century) and the *Vāstuvīdyā* (early 12th century), these texts all postdate the construction of Kumārapāla's temple as they were written by the end of the

¹⁰ *anne vi cauvvīsā cauvvīsāe jīṇāna pāsāyā | kāravīyā tivihāra-ppamuhā avae vi iha bahavo ||* (KPrat, p. 144, cf. introduction p. XII). On the development of multi-shrined Jain temples, see Hegewald 2002: 111-13; Hegewald 2009b: 94.

¹¹ Dundas 2007: 45, 175.

¹² PCi 91. 14; Tawney 1991: 143.

¹³ MRP I. 3+, tr. Leclère 2013: 411.

¹⁴ Jālōr stone inscription of Samarasimhadeva, Vikrama Saṃvat 1242, edited by Bhandarkar 1911-12 (cf. Leclère 2013: 335). In this inscription the temple is referred to under the alternative and colloquial name of Kuvaravihāra.

¹⁵ A manuscript of this Sanskrit poem was referenced by H. D. Velankar in the *Jinaratnakośa* (Poona, 1944), but the text has not been edited so far, with the exception of the stanza 87, published by Sārābhāi Maṇilāl Navāb in the *Anekārthasāhityasaṃgraha*, pp. 1-64, with an auto-commentary by Vardhamāna unfolding the 116 possible meanings of that stanza.

¹⁶ Patel 2004: 84f.

¹⁷ Dhaky 1975: 328-37.

twelfth century at the earliest. For instance, the *Aparājitapṛcchā*, a monumental treatise in Sanskrit, was compiled by Bhuvanadeva under the long reign of the Caulukya king Bhīma II (r. 1178-1240), and the *Vatthusārapayaraṇa* or *Treatise on the Quintessence of Architecture* was written in Prakrit by Ṭhakkura Pherū in 1315, under the reign of the Delhi Sultan ‘Alā al-Dīn Khaljī (r. 1296-1316).¹⁸ M. A. Dhaky also found in two other sources additional descriptions of Jain temples,¹⁹ but they belong to the thirteenth century as well, so that the information they provide can fit contemporary Jain temples such as the famous ones built by the Jain ministers Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla at Girnār or Ābū, but may be anachronistic for earlier ones.



Figure 1. View of the Ajitanātha temple from the South East, Taranga.

Photo: Author, 2007.

The purpose of the present article is to investigate the poetical descriptions of Kumārapāla’s temples elaborated closer to the time of their erection in order to see whether these poets merely relied on conventional images for describing these monuments, or if they gave valuable information about their plan, shape and decoration by using technical words. Thus it will be ascertained to which extent the vocabulary recorded by later treatises on

¹⁸ Dhaky 1975: 328-329; Patel 2004: 80-81; Hegewald 2009: 151. Two more technical sources were used by Dhaky, the *Prāsādamaṇḍana* by Sūtradhara Maṇḍana (middle of the fifteenth century) and the *Sabhāśṛṅgāra* (end of the fifteenth century).

¹⁹ Dhaky 1975: 331-33.

architecture was already in use during the twelfth century, or if there were other words for describing the sacred architecture that could draw upon earlier and now lost technical works.

2. Poetical Conventions

That the descriptions of Kumārapāla's temples are informed by the codes of *kāvya* style is an evidence: indeed, the court-poets had to display their poetical skills and to present these buildings in the most eulogistic and original way in order to celebrate the munificence of the king. Therefore, their texts abound in puns and variations on stereotyped motifs which were supposed to enhance the beauty of the monuments. The way king Kumārapāla himself depicts the great Kumāravihāra of Patan in Somaprabha's poem is highly representative of these embellishments:

On my command has been erected here the Kumāravihāra,
Lofty, charming like Mount Aṣṭāpada,²⁰ endowed with twenty-four Jain shrines.
Its golden cogged wheel makes it yellow, so that it looks like Mount Meru,
And the golden flag-staffs which it supports shine like wishing-trees.
Its sprigs being the golden pillars, its leaves the silken canopies drawn up,
Its flowers the hanging strings of pearls, its fruits the golden water-pots,
The genuine creeper of Beauty shines in this place,
Sprinkled by the thousand waves of brightness coming from Śrī Pārśva's body.
Made of moon-stone, the main image of Pārśva installed there
Makes the people's lotus-eyes unfold like the image of the moon.
As for the many other images made of gold, silver or brass,
Is there anyone they do not amaze?²¹

²⁰ For a translation of the glorification of Mount Aṣṭāpada inserted in Jinaprabha's *Vividhatīrthakalpa* (dated 1333 CE), see Cort 1993: 260-63 and Chojnacki 1995a: 93-112.

²¹ *dāūṇa ya āesaṃ kumāravihāro karāvio ettha |*
aṭṭhāvao vva rammo cauvīsa-jjīṇālo tuṃgo ||
kaṇayāmalasāra-pahāhiṃ piṃjare jammi meru-sāricche |
rehaṃti keudaṃḍā kaṇaya-mayā kappā-rukka vva ||
stambhaiḥ kandaliteva kāñcanamayair utkrṣṭa-paṭṭāṃśukol-
locaiḥ pallaviteva taiḥ kusumitevoccūlamuktāphalaiḥ |
sauvarṇaiḥ phaliteva yatra kalaśair ābhāti siktā satī
śrī-pārśvasya śarīra-kānti-laharī-lakṣeṇa lakṣmī-latā ||
pāsassa mūla-paḍimā nimmaviyā jattha caṃḍakāṃtamaī |
jaṇa-nayaṇa-kuvallaullāsa-kāriṇī caṃḍa-mutti vva ||
annāo vi bahuyāo cāmīyara-ruppa-pittalamaō |
loyassa kassa na kuṇaṃti vihmayaṃ jattha paḍimāo || (KPrat, p. 144)

For instance, the way the poet insists here on the height of the temple is typical of the laudatory style: the *śikhara* or tower which rises above the main image of the temple is usually said to touch the sky²² or likened to the highest peaks.²³ Accordingly, Somaprabha compares the Kumāravihāra with two famous mountains from the Himālaya range, the Aṣṭāpada and the Meru.²⁴ Besides the height, another feature of the temple highlighted by this comparison is its preciousness, since in Jain cosmology these mountains are said to be made of gold, silver and beryl.²⁵ No ordinary stone appears in the poems as building material for a Jain worship place; on the contrary, all its constituent parts are supposed to be built with various kinds of valuable metals or precious stones. In his *Century*, Rāmacandra mentions sapphire (*nīlāśma*, KVŚ 27, 58; *śitimani*, KVŚ 29; *nīlopala*, KVŚ 105; *nīlaratna*, KVŚ 111), emerald (*gāruḍaratna*, KVŚ 29; *marakata*, KVŚ 52), ruby (*śoṇagrāva*, KVŚ 45), cat's-eye gem (*vaidūryāśma*, KVŚ 23) and so on. The variously coloured rays thus emitted by these materials make the temple shine²⁶ and inspire the poets with many striking images. For instance, Rāmacandra imagines how the red hue of rubies endows any woman entering the temple with the embellishments characteristic of marital status:

Because of the network of rays coming from rubies appears the beauty of red lacquer on the sole of lotus-feet, a line of vermillion on the edge of the forehead, a cosmetic paste made of smooth sandal on a part of the body, a saffron brightness on the Chinese silk, the charming betel on the delicate lower lip: in this temple, even the ladies of the city who live in widowhood have all the finery of women who are not widowed.²⁷

²² KVŚ 16, 99. This is a conventional image that can be found in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, cf. Chojnacki 1995b: 79-80. Notwithstanding the poetical convention, the main tower of the Tribhuvanavihāra of the capital city may have been remarkably high, since the image appears systematically in its descriptions: this is the case in the contemporary sources (*tatto iheva nayare kāravio kumāravāla-deveṇa | garuo tihuṇavihāro gayana-taluttambhaṇa-kkhambho* || KPrat, p. 144; *edaṃ gayanaṅga-lagga-siharam jaṃ dūrādo dīsadi deulaṃ ittha visāle ramīyadi* | MRP IV. 19+, cf. Leclère 2013: 489), and one century later, Prabhācandra also insists on it when imagining the advice given by Hemacandra to Kumārapāla: “And for the benefit of your own father Tribhuvanapāla, cause to be made a glorious Jain sanctuary as lofty as the peak of Mount Meru” (*nija-vaptus tribhuvanapālasya sukṛtāya ca | meru-śṛṅgonnataṃ caityaṃ śrī-jainendraṃ vidhāpaya* || PCa XXII. 602).

²³ KVŚ 38, 76, 89 (*bhrāntimān*).

²⁴ He also says a little further that people rightly call Meru the main building of the Tribhuvanavihāra (*jo bhannai saccaṃ ciya jaṇeṇa meru tti pāsāo*, p. 144).

²⁵ Glasenapp 1999: 254.

²⁶ Everything is bright in a Jain sanctuary, cf. Chojnacki 1995b: 77f.

²⁷ *śoṇagrāvāṃśu-jālaiḥ krama-kamala-tale yāvaka-śrīr lalāṭa-prāṃte siṃdūra-rekhā masṛṇa-dhusṛṇa-bhūr aṃga-bhāge 'mga-rāgaḥ | kausumbhī cīna-paṭṭe dyutir adhara-dale hāri tāmbūlam itthaṃ yasmin vaidhavya-bhājo 'py avidhava-vanitā-maṃḍanāḥ paura-nāryaḥ* || (KVŚ 45)

Elsewhere, the antelope of the moon is said to mistake the green rays coming from the emerald pillars of the Kumāravihāra with the edible tendrils of a plant (KVŚ 52). A special mention must be also made of moon-stones and sun-stones: according to poetic conventions, the former are said to melt when touched by the moon-rays, while the second allegedly emit sparkles when touched by the sun-rays. A lot of images based on these properties can be found in Rāmacandra's *Century*, as instanced by the fifty-seventh stanza:

In this temple, while listening to a song as soft as honey during the night, people fold and unfold umbrellas above their head because of the drops of water oozing at every moment from the moon-stones; but at daytime, terrified by the glittering sparks of fire emitted by the sun-stones, they cling to the gateway, with watervessels put in their lotus-hands.²⁸

The variegated surfaces of the Jain temple are not only bright, they are also said to be polished enough to reflect perfectly any object or any person which happens to be in their proximity. It is a poetical convention that can be found easily in other poetical works from medieval India, such as Bilvamaṅgala's *Bālagopālastuti* or *Hymn to the Baby Cowherd*. In one stanza, the poet imagines that Kṛṣṇa's foster mother is abused by the mirroring nature of such a precious surface:

In a jewelled pillar Yaśodā saw the endlessly lovely reflection of the dancing Kṛṣṇa. She took it to be the second Kṛṣṇa and divided the lump of butter into two parts. (Tr. Wujastyk 2003: 91.)

Similarly, women are often mistaken in the *Kumāravihāraśataka*: some of them take their own image to be other women and think that the temple is overcrowded, while some others try to seize the reflection of the garlands of flowers which have been bestowed on the shrine's main statue.²⁹ But they are not the only ones to betray such naivety, and in accordance with the theory of poetical ornaments (*alaṃkāra*), the poet devises a lot of confusions (*bhrāntimān*)³⁰ that are provoked by these perfect reflections in the mind of simple people (KVŚ 74) or animals like birds (KVŚ 69, 89). For instance,

²⁸ *yāminyāṃ yatra lokāḥ pratikala-vigalac-caṃdrakāmtāmbu-pātair*
vyasta-nyastātapatrāḥ śirasi madhumayaṃ gītam ākarṇyayanti |
sūryāsmocchālītebhyaḥ punar ahani lasaj-jātavedaḥ-kaṇebhyaḥ
saṃtrastāḥ pāṇi-padma-sthita-jala-karakās toraṇaṃ sajjayanti || (KVŚ 57)

Other such images can be found in KVŚ 11, 33, 81, 83, 85, 104.

²⁹ KVŚ 20, 27. Other cases of women abused by their own reflect can be found in KVŚ 26, 58.

³⁰ For a definition of *bhrāntimān*, see Porcher 1978: 87-90.

Having seen their own image playing near their beloveds' reflection, feeling at that very moment their slender body trembling at the idea that it is another male, and striking then at the painted precious walls with the hard parts of their beaks³¹ and their diamond-like claws, the birds with their reddened eyes constantly bother the troop of guards in this temple.³²

Besides, Rāmacandra is also able to elaborate more original images on these conventions: in another stanza, he says that a silver pillar looks like a dance-master as it reflects a young woman performing a *lāsya* dance.³³

Notwithstanding the conventional devices poets made use of for extolling the beauty of the temples built by Kumārapāla, one may find faithful accounts of either the general layout of the temple or the details of its ornamentation, with an accurate usage of the technical vocabulary that contemporary architects and other artisans involved in the building of temples should have made use of.

3. Realistic and Technical Notations

3.1. The Main Building

The basic plan of the Jain temple from Western India is not different from that of contemporary Vaiṣṇava or Śaiva temples: the main image of the temple is installed in a room, the *garbhagrha*, above which stands a tower, the *śikhara*; then comes in the axis of this main shrine or *mūlaprāsāda* at least one other building, a pavilion or *maṇḍapa* meant to shelter the crowd of devotees and, when attached to the *mūlaprāsāda*, accessible to them through either one single axial vestibule or two more on each side as at Taranga (Fig. 1). This pavilion came to be known as the *gūḍhamaṇḍapa* or “closed pavilion” in architectural and literary sources dating back to the end of the twelfth century onwards, and the other buildings constructed in the axis were also considered as pavilions, the vestibule being for instance styled as the

³¹ In the Sanskrit commentary *caṃcukāṃḍair* is glossed with *caṃcusamūhair*, which means “a multitude of beaks”, but *kāṇḍa* can also refer, in anatomical science, to a kind of bone, in association with a part of the human or animal body, such as *pucchakāṇḍa*.

³² *ātmīyaṃ vīkṣya kāṃtā-pratinidhi-savidhe bimbam ākrīḍamānaṃ
tat-kālobuddha-kāṃpāṃ para-puruṣa-dhiyā gātra-yaṣṭiṃ vahaṃtaḥ |
āghnaṃtaś caṃcukāṃḍair atha nakha-kulīśai ratna-bhittīḥ sa-citrā
bādhaṃte rakṣakāṇāṃ gaṇam aruṇa-dr̥ṣo yatra nityaṃ vihaṃgāḥ ||* (KVŚ 74).

³³ KVŚ 61, tr. Leclère 2013: 331.

mukhamaṇḍapa or “opening pavilion”.³⁴ However, such compound words do not appear in earlier architectural sources from the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth centuries, and Rāmacandra seems to conform to that usage in the *Century*: except for one single occurrence, which will be discussed below, he simply talks about *maṇḍapas* (KVŚ 15, 18, 83, 101, 108), and even though he alludes to the sculpted ornamentation of these buildings, he focuses the description on the *mūlaprāsāda* of the Kumāravihāra in the same way as the other Jain poets.

From their descriptions, we know that a white “moon-stone” image of Pārśva, the twenty-third Jina, was installed in the *garbhagr̥ha* as the main image or *mūlanāyaka* of the temple.³⁵ In accordance with an age-old tradition, that image was surmounted by another one in emerald representing Dharaṇendra, the serpent-bodied *yakṣa* of Pārśva, and since the carnation of that Jina is traditionally said to be green, Rāmacandra punningly says in the twenty-ninth stanza that the statues are eventually endowed with the appropriate colour by shedding their rays upon each other.³⁶ In a very graphic way, the poet also depicts the serpent as “having made a sort of parasol (*chatra*) over the head of the deity” with his expanded hoods,³⁷ but there was also, as a token of homage to the Jina, a real parasol installed above his image:

³⁴ The vestibule has many other names, such as *mukhacatuṣkī*, that is “a set of four columns before the temple”, *trika*, *ṣaṭcatuṣkikā*, *navacatuṣkikā* (respectively three, six or nine such sets), and, if it is opened on the side of the *gūḍhamaṇḍapa*, *pārśvacatuṣkī*, “a lateral set of four columns”. In larger temples, the *trika* is preceded by another pavilion called *nṛtya-* or *raṅgamaṇḍapa*, and a *balānaka* or *nāli-maṇḍapa* stands in the same axis at the entrance of the complex (Dhaky 1975: 325-27, 343-45, 370-72; Patel 2004: 86, 170). For a more general discussion on the pavilions, cf. Dagens 2009: 123-30.

³⁵ Cf. the quotation of *Kumārapālapratibodha* above; KVŚ 10, 29. According to Prabhācandra, this image came from Nepal while Kumārapāla was visiting the Jain temple founded by his minister Vāgbhaṭa in Patan (*tatrāyātasya bhūpasya yayau nepāla-deśataḥ | śrī-bimbam ekaviṃśaty-aṅgulaṃ cāndramaṇī-mayam ||* PCa XXII. 605), and it is for installing it that the king wanted that temple to be given to him and afterwards renamed it Kumāravihāra (PCa XXII. 606-610). The word *garbhagr̥ha* does not appear in these descriptions, but it was known to poets, as proven by a passage from the *Moharājaparājaya* where Yaśaḥpāla describes the (probably imaginary) domestic shrine of the merchant Kubera: “May the king worship here, in the cella, the lotus-feet of Nemi, the illustrious Lord of Jinas, whose image is made of emerald” (*iha hi garbha-gr̥hāntar marakata-śilā-nirmita-mūrteḥ śrī-nemi-jina-pateḥ pādāravindaṃ vandatāṃ devaḥ |* MRP III. 28+, cf. Leclère 2013: 458).

³⁶ KVŚ 29, 30, 38, 77, 79, 101, 106. It can be noted that the Yakṣa is named Śeṣa in most of the occurrences. For the legend of Pārśva and the colour of his body, cf. Glasenapp 1999: 322f., 532. The earliest extant evidence of this association of Pārśva with a serpent is a statue dating back to the 1st century BCE (Quintanilla 2009: 117f.).

³⁷ *śeṣāher iva deva-murddhani-kṛta-cchatrasya* (KVŚ 30). The hoods are explicitly mentioned elsewhere in the *Century*: in one stanza, Rāmacandra describes Pārśva as having “the upper part of his body whitened by the streams of rays coming from the jewels of the serpent-king’s expanded hoods” (*devaṃ ... urageṃdra-sphuṭa-maṇi-kiraṇa-dhautottamāṅgam*, KVŚ v. 38), and later on, he says that people are afraid when perceiving in the yellowish precious eyes inserted in Dharaṇendra’s hoods some animation caused by the reflection of the crowd moving around (KVŚ 106).

From the waterpot of the parasol made of moon-stone which stands above and has become studded with a heap of rays entered through the holes of the lattice windows, it makes water charming as milk fall on the head of the Jina, and it makes an offering of divine flowers with the asterisms reflected on the precious surface of the courtyard. Ah! Even though staying in the sky, the white-rayed celestial body performs the ceremony of ablution in this temple!³⁸

Not only does Rāmacandra complete here the description of the main image of the Kumāravihāra of Patan, but he also informs us, by employing the technical word *jālī*, “lattice windows”,³⁹ that this temple was similar to the Kumāravihāra of Taranga, where the *garbhagrha* stills displays delicately pierced stone screens on the southern, western and northern walls (Fig. 2).



Figure 2. Western *jālī* of the cella, Taranga.

Photo: Author, 2007.

³⁸ *jālī-randhra-praviṣṭa-dyuti-caya-khacitāc caṃdrakāntāśma-k ptād
ūrdhva-sthād dugdha-mugdhaṃ jina-śirasi payaḥ pātayaṃś chatra-kumbhāt |
kurvan nakṣatra-bimbair ajira-maṇi-bhuvāṃ divya-puṣpopahāram
yatra vyomastha eva snapana-vidhim aho śveta-rociḥ karoti ||* (KVŚ 25).

For a contemporary image of Pārśva coming from Karnataka which is similarly surmounted by the hoods of Dharaṇendra and a parasol, see Granoff 2009: 184-89.

³⁹ Nanati and Dhaky: 81; Patel 2004: 170.

Another architectural feature of the lower part of the *mūlaprāsāda* that Rāmacandra accounts for in the *Century* is the existence in the Kumāravihāra of Patan of a system for evacuating from the *garbhagrha* the liquids poured on the main image during the ritual of bathing (*snapana* or *abhiṣeka*) referred to in the stanza translated above and many others (KVS̄ 10, 18, 23, 41, 59, 109, 114, 115). Indeed, it is said in the twenty-sixth stanza that the perfumed water used by devotees for the ablution of the Jina goes out of the temple “through the curved body of *makaras* the mouth of which is a water channel (*praṇālī*) made of cat’s eye” (*vaidūryāśma-praṇālī-mukha-makara-tatāir*, KVS̄ 23). Here again, a look at the Kumāravihāra temple of Taranga (Fig. 3) attests that the poet is not only aware of the slightest details of the building but also knows the right words to describe them faithfully.⁴⁰ According to B. Dagens, that usage appeared in India around the third-fourth centuries CE at the latest, and it can be explained by the belief, in a Hindu context, that what remains of an offering to a god must be considered as a polluting and potentially dangerous leftover. In some cases, the liquids are simply removed from the pedestal of the image through a spout, but generally they are driven out of the temple by a water channel running through the northern wall and ending with a “gargoyle” figure.⁴¹ When they adopted and adapted the formula of the Indian temple to their religious doctrine and practice, Jains did not necessarily retain the feature of the water channel, as illustrated by the Cāmuṇḍārāya temple of Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa (10th century).⁴² Yet it appears in other Jain temples such as the Tribhuvanatilakacūḍāmaṇi temple of Mūḍbidrī (15th century), and, on account of the situation of this sacred complex in the middle of the city, it has been recently surmised by A. Garimella that, far from being considered as polluting, the liquids were driven out of the temple because they could convey to people the sanctity of the image they had been poured on and thus bring them prosperity.⁴³

The lower registers of a *mūlaprāsāda* are usually peopled by a multitude of images, and even though he does not methodically describe the iconographical programme of the Kumāravihāra, Rāmacandra alludes quite often to the representation of celestial women (*putrikā* or *pañcalī*) on the outer walls of the temple (KVS̄ 11, 13, 15, 19, 79, 105). Indeed, these feminine figures are particularly numerous, as it can be observed at Taranga (Fig. 4).

⁴⁰ There are two ways for explaining the plural: either the *mūlaprāsāda* of the Kumāravihāra complex of Patan was endowed with several water channels or Rāmacandra refers also to the water channels of other *prāsādas* of that site.

⁴¹ Dagens 2009: 33, 37, 68-70.

⁴² Garimella 2005: 66f.

⁴³ Garimella 2005: 70f.



Figure 3. *prañālī* in the shape of a *makara*, base of the northern wall of the cella, Taranga.
Photo: Author, 2007.



Figure 4. Celestial ladies, northern wall of the cella, Taranga, Photo: Author, 2007.

Rāmacandra is so skilled in catching the attitudes that some descriptions can be linked with extant sculptures. For instance, the well-known posture of the young woman trying to get rid of a monkey, which can be seen for instance at the Queen step-well of Patan (built in the eleventh century) (Fig. 5), has been identified by P. Granoff in one stanza:

There, in that temple, the statue of a lady who struggled to hold fast to her girdle as a monkey untied its knot made young gallants feel desire and confirmed the steadfast in their rejection of sensual delights; it disgusted the pious and made old ladies feel embarrassed, while it made young men laugh and young girls wonder (KVŚ 112, tr. Granoff 1993: 90).

Rāmacandra also alludes to other kinds of sculptures, as for instance representations of couples (*mithuna*, KVŚ 37) in erotic postures such as the ones from Khajurao which were much decried when discovered in colonial times or the ones which can be observed at Taranga as well (Fig. 6).



Figure 5. Celestial lady annoyed by a monkey, Queen's stepwell, Patan.

Photo: Author, 2007.



Figure 6. Erotic scenes, railing of the southern *jālī* of the cella, Taranga. Photo: Author, 2007.



Figure 7. Lions on the lower part of the *śikhara*, Taranga. Photo: Author, 2007.

As regards the upper part of the *mūlaprāsāda*, it presents in Nāgara temples of the Maru-Gujara style a very distinctive silhouette with a tall elliptical spire (Fig. 1, 8). This element being the most characteristic and consequently most described part of the temple, it is not surprising that the Jain poets know the right word for describing it, *śikhara* (KVŚ 15, 16, 32, 35, 41, 53). What is more remarkable is the attempt of Rāmacandra to give an idea of its curved aspect by using the word *taṭī* twice,⁴⁴ just as he skilfully delineates the twisted body of the *makaras* with the word *taṭa*, “slope”, in the previous quotation.⁴⁵ The word *taṭī* similarly refers to any curved surface, as proven by the fact that Rāmacandra also employs it for depicting the slope of a mountain or the rounded forehead of a woman (KVŚ 32, 58). Besides, the poet does not forget to mention that the main spire of the temple is covered in its lower sections by subsidiary spires or little turrets, which he accurately calls *śṛṅga* (KVŚ 32, 55, 88), and he elaborates many images on the presence of sculpted figures on the tower. For instance, he imagines that, in spite of Aruṇa’s efforts, the chariot of the Sun cannot pass over the tower of the temple since the horses are frightened by the lions which adorn the lower part of the wide curved tower (KVŚ 16), an image all the more adapted since the lions still preserved at Taranga are facing East (Fig. 7). Elsewhere, Paulomī advises Indra to ride his mighty horse Uccaiḥśravas to come to the Kumāravihāra, since his elephant might be put to flight by the lions installed on the subsidiary spires (*śṛṅga-sthebhyo haribhyaḥ*).⁴⁶

Strictly speaking, the trunk of the *śikhara* ends with a platform which is considered in the architectural treatises as the shoulders of the *mūlaprāsāda* and called for that reason the *skandha-vedī*⁴⁷ since it supports the head of the edifice. Rāmacandra is acquainted with this anthropomorphic vision of the temple tower and uses either the word *skandha* or its synonym *aṃsa* in the *Century* (KVŚ 36, 37, 51). He also speaks of the top of the temple as a head, just like Yaśaḥpāla when he briefly described some years later the Kumāravihāra of Patan in one stanza of his play.⁴⁸ More precisely, there is between the *skandhavedī* and the head a part logically called the “neck” (*grīva*), and the head itself is further divided into several parts, the most important and voluminous being the “cogged wheel” or “myrobolan fruit” (*āmalaka* or *āmalasāraka*) and above it the “jar” or “water-pot” (*kalaśa*).⁴⁹ As we have seen above,

⁴⁴ *śikhara-prthu-taṭī* (KVŚ 15); *śikhara-guru-taṭī* (KVŚ 16).

⁴⁵ Although the Sanskrit commentary published along the text pretends that the word is merely intended to enhance the beauty of the text (*taṭa-śabdaḥ śobhārthaḥ*).

⁴⁶ KVŚ 88. Rāmacandra also alludes to the presence of images of goddesses on the tower (KVŚ 15).

⁴⁷ Nanati & Dhaky 1969: 82.

⁴⁸ *mūrdhan* (KVŚ 95), *mauli* (MRP III. 57).

⁴⁹ Nanavati and Dhaky 1969: 81; Patel 2004: 169f.; Hardy 2015: 285f. For translations of sections of Bhoja’s *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* (11th century) dealing with the summit of various kinds of Nāgara temples, see Hardy 2015: 139f., 146-48, 152f., 156, 161f.

Somaprabha employs both these technical terms for describing the great Kumāravihāra of Patan. In contrast, the other poets merely mention the jar-shaped pinnacle, using either the word *kalaśa*⁵⁰ or a synonym such as *kumbha*,⁵¹ even though this word has a different meaning in architectural theory, referring then to the foot moulding of temple base.⁵² Besides, the *skandhavedī* also supports a staff, *daṇḍa*,⁵³ which is occasionally compared to an arm in keeping with the vision of the tower as a body:

This temple bears at the place of its shoulders long staffs which are turned upwards like steady arms climbing the lower part of the sky in order to rob by force the heavenly treasures.⁵⁴

The raison d'être of this staff is to bear a banner, *dhvaja* (KVŚ 32, 98; MRP III. 57) or *ketu* (KVŚ 37, 49, 95), which explains why it can be called a *dhvajadhāra* or “banner-holder” in technical sources.⁵⁵ According to Rāmacandra, the *daṇḍa* of the Kumāravihāra of Patan was topped with a jar-shaped pinnacle,⁵⁶ and decorated with small bells called *kiṃkiṇī*.⁵⁷ All these architectural details can also be seen at Taranga (Fig. 8). Similarly, the Tribhuvanavihāra of Patan was crowned with the expect set of elements consisting in a golden cogged wheel, a golden jar and a golden flagstaff.⁵⁸

⁵⁰ See the quotation from Somaprabha's *Kumārapālpratibodha* above.

⁵¹ KVŚ 41. References to golden jars in plural can be understood as encompassing not only the pinnacle of the *mūlaprāsāda*'s tower but also those of the other buildings in the Kumāravihāra complex (KVŚ 14, 19, 53, 91). In one occurrence, it may be surmised that *kumbha* refers to real jars, as they are said to contain water coming from the Gaṅgā (KVŚ 33). As for v. 37, the mention of *kumbha* is so brief and general that it can refer simultaneously to pinnacles and water pots.

⁵² Hardy 2015: 286.

⁵³ KVŚ 36, 41, 49, 91, 95, 102. The *Century* corroborates the information found in the above quotation of the *Kumārapālpratibodha* that the staff was made of gold (KVŚ 63).

⁵⁴ *ārūḍhān vyoma-pīṭhīm haṭha-haraṇa-kṛte saṃpadāṃ svargajānām bāhu-stambhān ivordvān vahati yad alaghūn aṃsa-deśeṣu daṇḍān* (KVŚ 51).

⁵⁵ Nanati and Dhaky 1969: 81.

⁵⁶ KVŚ 41 (*kumbha*), 63 (*kalaśa*).

⁵⁷ *yasyetthaṃ ketu-damdaḥ kathayati jagate kiṃkiṇīnām ninādaiḥ* (KVŚ 49).

⁵⁸ *kaṃcaṇamaya-āmalasāra-kalasa-keuppahāhiṃ piṃjarīo* (KPrat, p. 144).



Figure 8. Taranga, view of the *śikhara* from the North West, with *āmalasāra*, *kalaśa* and *dhvaja*. Photo: Author, 2007.

Lastly, it can be noted that Rāmacandra, when he evokes people entering the temple, mentions on two occasions, with the appropriate term, the lintel (*uttaraṃga*, KVŚ 81, 104) which forms with the door-jambes the frame of the door (*dvāra*). These architectural elements were decorated with Jain deities and symbols indicating the affiliation of the temple, as shown by M. A. Dhaky (1984-85: 34f.) about the so-called Samiddheśvara temple of Chittor, which was originally dedicated to a Jina.

3.2. The Subsidiary Buildings

As mentioned above, the *mūlaprāsāda* of the Kumāravihāra of Patan was preceded by one *maṇḍapa* at least, but it was also surrounded by many other buildings. Indeed, one characteristic of the Jain temple is the accumulation of subsidiary shrines called *devakulikā* around the main one, for housing images of other Jinas that the one installed in the *garbhagrha*.⁵⁹ Indeed, Somaprabha indicates in the passage of the *Kumārapālapratibodha* quoted above that the temple of Pārśva was “endowed with twenty-four Jain temples” (*cauvīsa-jīṇālo*):⁶⁰ in other words, it was surrounded by a kind of cloister along which had been built twenty-four minor cell-like shrines dedicated to the twenty-four Jinas of

⁵⁹ Hegewald 2002: 118f.

⁶⁰ Cf. the quotation from the *Kumārapālapratibodha* translated above.

the present cosmic period.⁶¹ Though not giving the exact number of these temples, Rāmacandra already evoked in the *Century* the pavilions of the “outer temples” (*bāhyānām devadhāmnām*, KVS 18), thus suggesting that they presented on a reduced scale the basic plan of a temple: a cella and before it, a covered space for accommodating devotees. Such an organisation was not uncommon by the twelfth century, and the number of these subsidiary shrines can even amount to seventy-two, as was the case in the Tribhuvanavihāra complex of Patan:⁶² besides the most known Jinas were represented within the sacred complex two other sets of twenty-four Jinas, the Jinas from the previous cosmic period and the Jinas who are to appear in the next one.⁶³ In other cases, the sanctuary could display a greater variety of monuments, such as the thirty-two temples that Kumārapāla had erected next to the Tribhuvanavihāra in order to atone for the sins committed with his thirty-two teeth: indeed after converting to Jainism the king felt very guilty for having eaten meat in his young years, and Hemacandra, when asked how to expiate that bad behaviour, told him to build as many temples as he had teeth.⁶⁴ In the *Prabhāvaka-carita*, Prabhācandra describes this complex with many interesting details:

The king caused to be built thirty-two excellent temples, with towers seven *hasta* high and coloured in the following way: two white, two black, two with the colour of a red lotus, two blue and sixteen with a golden hue. In twenty-four sanctuaries were the glorious [Jinas of this era], beginning with Ṛṣabha, and in four abodes, four [other Jinas] beginning with Sīmandhara. Also an illustrious Rohiṇi, a preaching assembly, the foot-prints of lords, an Aśoka tree: this is the way the thirty-two temples were set up. Then, in conformity with his previous declarations, the king informed the lord [Hemacandra] about that, implying that he was free from debt towards the thirty-two men.⁶⁵ A glorious

⁶¹ Patel 2004: 81; Hegewald 2009a: 262-65.

⁶² KPrat, introduction p. XI-XII. For designating these little shrines, Somaprabha aptly employs the technical word *devakulikā* (in a more or less Prakritised form: *devauliyāsu* and *devakuliyāhiṃ* p. 144, cf. also KCS p. 121). The word also appears in Jinaharṣa’s *Vastupālacaritra*, where it is said that Tejahpāla installed jar-shaped pinnacles with lofty flagstaffs on the top of the seventy-two *devakulikā* of the Munisuvrata temple of Broach (*nyadhād dvāsaptatau devakulikāsu tadaiva ca | uddaṇḍa-dhvaja-daṇḍāḍhyān kalaśān vimala-dyutīn || Vastupālacaritra*, VII. 103, quoted in the notes to HMM, p. II).

⁶³ On the future Jinas, see Dundas 2009: 32.

⁶⁴ MRP IV. 19+, tr. Leclère 2013: 490; PCa XXII. 601; PCi 90. 20-31; Tawney 1991: 141f.

⁶⁵ The complex was built by Kumārapāla in relation to his thirty-two teeth, but there is also alternative narrative according to which Kumārapāla wanted to break with thirty-two Brahmins who had encouraged him to eat meat (MRP IV. 19+, cf. Leclère 2013: 490). The double meaning of *dvija*, “tooth” and “twice-born Brahmin” may account for the coexistence of these two explanations.

Lord Jina Neminātha of one hundred twenty-five *āṅgula* high was installed in the religious complex called the glorious Tihūṇapāla, which was twenty-five *hasta* high, and Kumārapāla had Jain sanctuaries built by other people in every place of the country.⁶⁶

It appears that besides the twenty-four temples dedicated to the current Jinas, and coloured according to their respective complexions,⁶⁷ the sanctuary also included more original monuments: there were four other buildings dedicated to another group of Tīrthaṅkaras who, thanks to the mention of Sīmandhara, may be identified with the four “Wandering Jinas” (*viharamāṇa*) currently preaching in the Mahāvideha region,⁶⁸ and in order to reach the desired number of thirty-two, four more symbols of the Jain faith were added. Among them, the preaching assembly (*samavasaraṇa*) is the less surprising: representations of this circular building supposed to be erected by gods when a Jina is about to deliver his teachings are not uncommon in Jain sacred complex,⁶⁹ and one such image can be found within the precincts of the Kumāravihāra of Taranga, housed in a subsidiary building (Fig. 9).

As regards the Aśoka tree, it must be noted that Jainism incorporated quite early the cult of trees,⁷⁰ and the very name of this kind of tree (*a-śoka*, “without grief”) may be an allusion to the dispassionate nature of the Jinas. It can also refer more precisely to a predicate of the Jinas as well, since the tree standing in the centre of their preaching assemblies is sometimes explicitly said to be an *aśoka*.⁷¹ The foot-prints of deceased teachers are also a

⁶⁶ *prāsādaiḥ sapta-hastaiś ca yathā-varṇair mahīpatiḥ | dvātriṃśataṃ vihārāṇāṃ sārāṇāṃ niramāpayat ||
dvau śubhrau śyāmalau dvau ca dvau raktotpala-varṇakau | dvau nīlau ṣoḍaśātha syuḥ prāsādāḥ kanaka-
[prabhāḥ ||
caturviṃśati-caityeṣu śrīmanto ṛṣabhādayaḥ | sīmaṃdharādyās catvāraś caturṣu nilayeṣu ca ||
śrī-rohiṇiś ca samavasaraṇaṃ prabhu-pādukāḥ | aśoka-viṭapī caivaṃ dvātriṃśat sthāpitās tadā ||
dvātriṃśataḥ puruṣāṇāṃ anrṇo 'smīti garbhītam | vyajjñapat prabhor bhūpaḥ pūrva-vākyānusārataḥ ||
sa-pañca-viṃśati-śatāṅgula-māno jineśvaraḥ | śrīmat-tihūṇapālākhye pañca-viṃśati-hastake ||
vihāre 'sthāpyata śrīmān neminātho 'parair api | samasta-deśa-sthāneṣu jaina-caityān acīkarat ||
(PCa XXII. 681-687)*

⁶⁷ Cf. Glasenapp 1999: 531f. In the Śvetāmbara canonical corpus, these complexions are given for instance in the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*, 376 (communication of Christine Chojnacki).

⁶⁸ Cf. Dundas 2002: 268-70; 2009: 32.

⁶⁹ Hegewald 2009b: 99.

⁷⁰ There are representations of tree shrines on the large stone devotional plaques from the beginnings of Christian era that have been discovered near Mathurā (cf. Quintanilla 2009: 118f.).

⁷¹ See for instance the detailed description of a preaching assembly in Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā* (tr. Chojnacki 2008: 304-307). In contrast, Hemacandra simply evokes a *caitya* tree when describing, for instance, the first preaching assembly of Ṛṣabha or Mahāvīra in the *Triśaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra* (tr. Johnson vol. I, p. 192 and vol. VI, p. 125 respectively). One more possibility is that the *aśoka* refers to the first meditation of the Jina Ṛṣabha (cf. TSPC, tr. Johnson vol. I, p. 165; Granoff 2009: 162).

traditional object of devotion in Jainism, and may suggest here another important moment in the life of the Jinas, that is the attainment of liberation from this world.⁷²



Figure 9. Scale model of a preaching assembly housed in a subsidiary pavilion, South-eastern corner of the courtyard, Taranga. Photo: Author, 2007.

Lastly, the mention of a Rohiṇī amongst these objects of worship remains a little enigmatic, but it can be a representation of the first goddess of learning (*vidyādevatā*) from the list of sixteen given by Hemacandra in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*.⁷³ It may also be surmised that Kumārapāla commanded to be sculpted an image of the virtuous Jain laywoman of that name: indeed, her story seems to have been popular at that time, as proven for instance by the fact that the contemporary Jain writer Āmradeva expanded upon it in his commentary to the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*.⁷⁴ In any way, the depiction of this particular religious complex proves that the members of the Jain community did not focus their devotion exclusively on the

⁷² On the *pādukā*, see for instance Hegewald 2002: 109.

⁷³ Cf. Glasenapp 1999: 406, 483. See Dhaky 1984-85: 34 and Fig. 9 for a depiction of the goddess Rohiṇī on the outer wall of the “Samiddheśvara” temple of Chittor.

⁷⁴ Jain 1993: 75.

images of the Jinas, but that they also revered the memory of exemplary religious and lay people as well.

Though primarily meant for the cult of Jinas and other illustrious followers of Jain doctrine, the Jain temple was also a setting for many other activities. Some sanctuaries could be endowed with various commodities meant to help people out of charity: in the middle of the thirteenth century, for instance, the Jain layman Jaitrasimha, son of the great minister Vastupāla, erected for the benefit of his deceased uncle Tejaḥpāla a temple with a tank (*sarovara*), a rest-house (*dharmasālā*) and an alms-house (*satrālaya*).⁷⁵ According to Somaprabha, such a charitable institution was founded by Kumārapāla, but it is not explicitly connected to any of his temples.⁷⁶

Another important function of the Jain temple was to provide Jain monks with a shelter for teaching the tenets of Jainism. We know for instance from two sectarian sources that in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, the monk Devendrasūri expounded the doctrine in the Kumārapālavihāra which stood by the city square of Stambhatīrtha.⁷⁷ Admittedly, the preaching could take place anywhere within the precincts of the temple, either under one of the several pavilions or temporary shelters such as canopies suspended from the surrounding buildings, but the existence of a place especially meant for teaching at least in the biggest sanctuaries is beyond doubt. In accordance with the way contemporary Jains themselves designate such a place, Western scholars make use of the term *maṭha*,⁷⁸ but it must be noted that a *maṭha* is strictly speaking a monastery, that is a place where religious people gather in order to dedicate themselves to their religious life. Admittedly, studying religious texts is an important dimension of the daily life of these renouncers, and as such *maṭha* is a home to teachers and students, but it also consists in praying, meditating, performing rites and even more secular occupations. A glance at Uddyotana's malicious description of the life of a Southern monastery's residents in *Kuvalayamālā* (779 CE) suffices to realize that they could also enjoy various entertainments besides studying.⁷⁹ The remnants

⁷⁵ See Jinahaṛṣa's *Vastupāla*, VIII. 592-593, quoted in the notes to HMM, p. I-II. Cf. Hegewald 2009a: 175.

⁷⁶ KPrat, introduction p. XIII; KCS, p. 126.

⁷⁷ These sources are the autocommentary of Dharmasāgara's *Tapāgacchapaṭṭāvalīsūtra* and the autocommentary of Nayasundara's *Brhatposālikapaṭṭāvalī* (both dating back to the second half of the sixteenth century), cf. Dundas 2007: 175-176. The wording is almost the same, except that the conjunction *ca* is missing in Nayasundara's version: *stambhatīrthe (ca) catuspatha-sthīta-kumārapālavihāre dharmadeśanāyām*. Yet the translations by Dundas slightly diverge, and it seems more likely that the sermon took place « at the temple endowed by Kumārapāla in the city square » rather than « beside Kumārapāla's temple in the public square », as Nayasundara's account is rendered (Dundas 2007: 45, 49).

⁷⁸ See for instance Hegewald 2009a: 174; Del Bontà 2009.

⁷⁹ Chojnacki 2008b: 439-47.

of medieval Śaiva monasteries from central India also show that the hall for instruction or *vidyā-vyākhyā-maṇḍapa*, identifiable by the presence of a seat for the *guru*, was only one room in a complex made of many other spaces.⁸⁰ In an even clearer way, an inscription dated 1155 CE dealing with the foundation of Śaiva temple by the Cedi queen Alhaṇadevī presents a monastery (*maṭha*) and a lecture hall (*vyākhyāna-sālā*) as distinct parts of the religious complex.⁸¹ In other words, a study hall may be a part of a monastery but could also stand as a distinct building within the precincts of a temple. Such was the case in the great Kumāravihāra of Aṇahillapura, as indicated by Rāmacandra no less than four times in his *Century*. For instance, he describes the bewilderment of young children before what looks like an open structure with a heavy roof resting on tall and thin pillars:

“Oh, look, how could such a big load have been put on these pillars tied with *ketaka* leaves!” Their mind filled with such amazement, the multitude of children look with emotion at the lecture house (*vyākhyā-gr̥ha*) which stands in this temple.⁸²

The presence of children suggests that this building could be a school-room for young people, but its very name, a compound word which undergoes slight variations in the *Century* but always has *vyākhyā* as the first member,⁸³ clearly indicates that it was also meant for the explanation of religious texts by monks to an audience of adult people, most often belonging to the Jain *saṅgha* but sometimes also coming from other socio-religious communities. For instance, Prabhācandra retells in the *Prabhāvaka-carita* an anecdote about Hemacandra delivering in a Jain temple called Caturmukha⁸⁴ a lecture (*vyākhyāna*) on the *Life of Nemi*, a

⁸⁰ Sears 2014: 22, 82f. It is worth noting that Tamara Sears borrows the technical term *vidyā-vyākhyā-maṇḍapa* from the enumeration of the constituent parts of a *maṭha* which can be found in the *Aparājita-pr̥chhā* (Sears 2014: 123).

⁸¹ Kielhorn 1894: 7.

⁸² *stambheṣu ketaka-dala-grathiteṣu haṃta bhāro mahān katham amīṣu niveśito 'yam | itthaṃ savismaya-manas-taralāni yatra vyākhyā-gr̥haṃ śīśu-kulāni vilokayanti ||* (KVŚ 42)

The compound *ketaka-dala-grathiteṣu* is not easily understandable. Even though it could refer to a decoration made of real *ketaka* leaves, I suppose that the children are here misled by the vase-and-foliage and other plant-like motifs pillars are often adorned with in Maru-Gurjara style (Patel 2004: 170; Hardy 2007: 153-55).

⁸³ *vyākhyā-vilāsa-sadana* (KVŚ 39), *vyākhyā-saṃsad* (KVŚ 72), *vyākhyā-veśman* (KVŚ 105).

⁸⁴ This name probably means that the temple had four entrances in the four directions, in conformity with a specifically Jain architectural model intended to imitate the model of a Jina's preaching assembly and illustrated by the famous Ādinātha temple of Ranakpur built in 1439 CE (cf. Hegewald 2002: 113-15; Hegewald 2009b: 94-6).

section of his famous *Triśaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* or *Lives of the Sixty-Three Great Men*, before an audience of Jains and adepts of all the other creeds.⁸⁵

Besides the lecture hall, Rāmacandra mentions in his description of the great Kumāravihāra complex two other specific buildings that do not figure among the constituent parts of a Jain temple as described in the extant treatises on Western Indian architecture: a theatre hall and a painting gallery. Admittedly, there exists among the several buildings that could be erected in the axis of the *mūlaprāsāda* or main shrine a pavilion which is given in some technical and literary sources a name evoking performances: the *nṛtya-* or *raṅga-maṇḍapa*.⁸⁶ In the treatises on dramaturgy, indeed, *nṛtya* refers to various kinds of danced spectacles while *raṅga* designates the stage.⁸⁷ Besides, the scenic vocation of this building is corroborated by an inscription from 1211 CE recording the addition to the original Kumāravihāra of Jābālipura of an intermediate pavilion for spectacles (*prekṣā-madhya-maṇḍapa*).⁸⁸ However, an examination of the extant *raṅgamaṇḍapas* from Mount Ābū clearly shows that such pavilions could be used merely for performing dances.⁸⁹ For staging plays, a specific theatre hall was necessary, and, even though it had a “pavilion of spectacles” (*prekṣā-maṇḍapa*) at the expected place, in the axis of the main tower,⁹⁰ the Kumāravihāra of the capital city was also endowed with such a building. It must be noted that Rāmacandra never presents the theatre hall as a pavilion but as a “house”,⁹¹ which probably means that it stood on its own foundations apart from the main shrine and the other buildings, in a way similar to the surviving temple theatres from Kerala.

As regards the painted decorations, they are not uncommon in Jain religious buildings: narrative texts from the first millennium testify to a very ancient tradition of decorating

⁸⁵ *caturmukhākhyā-jainendrālaye vyākhyānam adbhutam | śrī-nemicaritasyāmī śrī-saṅghāgre pratuṣṭuvuḥ || sudhā-sāra-vacaḥ-stomākṛṣṭa-mānasa-vāsanāḥ | śuśrūṣavaḥ samāyanti tatra darśanino 'khilāḥ ||* (PCa XXII. 141f., cf. Bühler 1936: 19f.).

⁸⁶ Dhaky 1975: 349-51.

⁸⁷ Leclère 2010: 46f.

⁸⁸ Bhandarkar 1911-12: 55. The pavilion can be said to be “intermediate” since, in the ideal organization of a Western Jain temple, it stands, roughly speaking, between the closed pavilion or *gūḍhamaṇḍapa* and the entrance pavilion called *balānakamaṇḍapa* (see for instance the description from the *Sirivatthusārāpayaṇa*, a treatise on architecture written at the beginning of the fourteenth century, as summed up by Dhaky 1975: 331f.).

⁸⁹ Leclère 2010: 49f.

⁹⁰ Indeed, the golden jar (*kumbha*) which stands above this “pavilion for spectacles” forms a line (*āvalī*) with the jars crowning the closed pavilion, the tower, and the flagstaff (KVŚ 41).

⁹¹ The poet names it a “house for theatre” (*gr̥ham nātyasya*, KVŚ 72), a “house for the entertainment of theatre” (*nātya-līlā-gr̥ha*, KVŚ 83) or more simply a “house for entertainment” (*līlā-niśānta*, KVŚ 111). In another of his works, the *Nātyadarpaṇa* or *Mirror of Theatre* co-authored with Guṇacandra, Rāmacandra employs the word *nātya-śālā* or “theatre hall”, which also appears in eleventh-century inscriptions from Karnataka (cf. Leclère 2013: 336).

temples in such way,⁹² and up to now, some monuments have thus preserved old mural or ceiling paintings which illustrate the life of the Jinas, as exemplified by the Vardhamāna temple of Tituparuttikunram and the Jain monastery of Śravana Beḷgola.⁹³ The Kumāravihāra of Aṇahillapura was also decorated with paintings in various places, beginning with the *garbhagrha* of the temple: as early as the tenth stanza of his *Century*, Rāmacandra says that the luminous white statue of Pārśvanātha looks like a milk ocean that would not have been churned, since it reflects the surrounding mural paintings representing images of horse, tree, moon, cow, goddess of beauty, elephant.⁹⁴ Yet the presence of a building specifically intended to house paintings within the sacred complex is noteworthy, and we have a glimpse of the variety of the themes depicted thanks to one stanza from the *Century*: as U. P. Shah sums it up, it had paintings of elephants, monkeys, camels, chariots, lives of gods and goddesses, wars between gods and demons as well as scenes from several dramatic works (*nāṭya*).⁹⁵ Unfortunately, in contrast with the words *paṭṭaśālā* and *paṭṭakaśālā* found in narrative texts by U. P. Shah,⁹⁶ the expressions used by Rāmacandra for designating this hall of paintings – here *citrasya saṃsad*, elsewhere *citrālaya* – do not enable us to determine whether these artworks were produced on movable surfaces such as scrolls, boards or panels and then fixed to the walls of the gallery. However, there is one reference in the *Century* to drawing sessions (*ālekhyā-sabhā*)⁹⁷ which suggests that painters worked most often directly on walls:

In this temple, when drawing sessions take place, the eagerness of artists for producing the beauty of colourful compositions bears fruit on one wall only; yet, because of the appearing of reflections, there are also painted compositions on the other walls which are facing it, as colours assume nuances on contact with precious stones.⁹⁸

⁹² Cf. Shah 1983: 208f.

⁹³ Cf. Del Bontà 2009.

⁹⁴ *saṃkrāmadbhis turamga-druma-śaśi-surabhi-śrī-gajair bhitti-citraiḥ saubhāgyaṃ dugdha-sindhor avidita-manthanotpāta-bādhasya dhatte* (KVŚ 10). Other allusions to painted decorations can be found in KVŚ 37, 74 (see the translation above).

⁹⁵ *vyālair bālān gajeṃdraiḥ kapi-karabha-rathair grāmya-sārthāṃś caritraiḥ śraddhālūn devatānāṃ nṛpati-mṛgadr̥ṣo vāsavāṃtaḥpurībhiḥ nānā-nāṭyair naṭāughān maru-dasura-bhavaiḥ saṃgarair vīra-vargān ekākiny eva lokāṃś taralayati muhur yatra citrasya saṃsat ||* (KVŚ 110). Cf. Shah 1983: 208. For a full translation, see Granoff 1993: 90.

⁹⁶ These texts are Jaṭāsīmhanandin's *Varāṅgacarita* and Jinasena's *Ādipurāṇa* (cf. Shah 1983: 208f.).

⁹⁷ Although this word could be understood as an equivalent of *citrālaya*, the fact that it is used at the plural locative leads me to propose this interpretation.

⁹⁸ *yatrālekhyā-sabhāsu citra-racanā-saubhāgya-saṃpādanā-*

That the Kumāravihāra of Aṇahillapura was endowed with these three buildings seems to have been quite exceptional, since they are selected among other interesting features of the complex by a temple attendant who shows a group of women around (KVŚ 72-73).

The last kind of monument which could be seen in the Kumāravihāra complex according to Rāmacandra's testimony was a great gateway or *toraṇa* (KVŚ 57, 108). It is even possible to surmise that there was not one isolated *toraṇa* since it is said in the second occurrence of the *Century* that, be they inhabiting the capital or coming from abroad, all people stared with amazement "before each *torāṇa*" (*pratitorāṇam*). The presence of several *torāṇa* within the Kumāravihāra complex is not unlikely, since the Sun temple of Modhera (eleventh century) still displays the remnants of two *torāṇa*, one in the axis of the main shrine and the other, in a less preserved shape, north from it. It is also possible that *torāṇa* does refer in the first instance to a monumental arch and in the other to the arches installed within the temple between two columns.

3.3. The Courtyard

To conclude this tour of the Kumāravihāra of Patan, we can now consider the very area on which all these buildings stood. According to the extant technical sources, the Jain temple of Western India was built on a vast platform called *jagatī*, which was accessible through a flight of stairs covered or not by a pavilion.⁹⁹ Yet the word *jagatī* is conspicuously absent from the poetical texts under review and from Rāmacandra's *Century* in particular. What we find instead is the word *vedī* which, when not qualified (*dvāra-vedī*, KVŚ 52, 54), obviously refers to the whole surface of the courtyard (KVŚ 83, 105), also called more occasionally *aṅgira* (KVŚ 83) or *prthvī* (KVŚ 80). This usage is all the more interesting since *vedī* (or *vedibandha*) is said to refer to the plinth of the Nāgara temple in the glossaries of architectural terms, and its diminutive *vedikā* to a balustrade.¹⁰⁰ As reminded by B. Dagens, the word *vedī* originally referred to the "altar" in the Vedic context; since then it has evolved in a complex way and has probably acquired the meaning of "balustrade" because a fence was associated with an altar in cults such as that of the Bodhi tree in Buddhism.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, the plinth of the main temple may have been considered as an extension of the altar put in front of

saṃrambhaḥ phalam eti śilpakṛtinām ekatra bhittau kvacit |
sāmmukhyaṃ bhajatām punar maṇi-śilā-vyāsaṅga-raṅgat-tviṣām
bimballāsa-vaśena citra-ghaṭanā bhitty-aṃtarāṇām api || (KVŚ 93).

⁹⁹ Dhaky 1975: 323.

¹⁰⁰ Nanati & Dhaky 1969: 83; Patel 2004: 173; Hardy 2007: 244.

¹⁰¹ Dagens 2009: 43f.

the image of the deity within the *garbhagrha*. But in Rāmacandra's *Century*, *vedī* has the even broader meaning of temple platform, which could be explained in two non-exclusive ways, the one being that the temple stands on the platform like an offering to the deity put on an altar, the other that the platform has a surface as even as an altar.

A last example of what these medieval poems can teach us about the technical vocabulary concerns the term *vitāna*. In most glossaries and studies on Indian architecture, *vitāna* is said to mean "ceiling", and various categories of *vitāna* as ceilings are even listed by specialists.¹⁰² Yet it is never used in that sense throughout Rāmacandra's *Century*, but for referring to a hanging piece of coloured cloth. For instance, it is said in one stanza that some people think painters have wrongly painted pictures on the outer walls of the temple because of the reflection of multi-coloured *vitānas* on the bright surface made of moon-stone (KVŚ 12). Would *vitāna* have designated ceilings, how could they have been reflected outside of the buildings? Besides, the Sanskrit commentary confirms several times the equivalence of *vitāna* with *ulloca* and *candrodaya*, two other words meaning "canopy",¹⁰³ and the canopies of the temple are explicitly said in one stanza from the *Century* to be made of silk.¹⁰⁴ When trying to reconstitute the general appearance of a medieval temple, we also have to think about these series of canopies suspended over the open areas besides taking into consideration the more architectural parts of the complex.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the study of the poetical descriptions of Kumārapāla's temples reveals that the Jain writers, though elaborating many hyperbolic images in order to extol the munificence of this great Jain king, nonetheless gave a rather faithful account of the specificities of these buildings. Their mastery of the technical vocabulary of architecture may be related to the fact that, at the royal court, the Jain monks could interact with many craftsmen and artists. As a matter of fact, Rāmacandra himself refers more than once in the *Century* to craftsmen (*śilpin*, KVŚ 13; *śilpakṛtin*, KVŚ 93), painters (*citrakara*, KVŚ 12) and architects (*sūtrakṛt*, KVŚ 72), and we may surmise that his sensibility to the most minute details of the Kumāravihāra complex resulted not only from the reading of treatises but also from the frequentation of all these people. The diffusion of architectural science is further proven by a famous anecdote

¹⁰² Nanati & Dhaky 1969: 83; Dhaky 1975: 337; Patel 2004: 99-101, 173.

¹⁰³ See the commentary on KVŚ 12, 26, 37. The only case where *vitāna* is not glossed is KVŚ 16. The word *ulloca* is used in the Sanskrit stanza from the *Kumārapālapratibodha* quoted and translated above. For some more lexicographical comments on *candrodaya*, see Balbir 1982: 64f.

¹⁰⁴ *etān paśyata cīna-cīra-racitāṃś candrodayān* (KVŚ 73). That they are pieces of cloth is also confirmed by the fact that the rays of light coming from different parts of the Kumāravihāra are compared to "trembling canopies" (*taralāṃś candrodayān*, KVŚ 101).

from the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, dealing with the slightly later time of the Jain minister Vastupāla. Having built on Mount Ābū a temple in the memory of his deceased brother Lūniga, Merutuṅga says, Vastupāla invited from Jābālipura his friend the minister Yaśovīra for asking him a judgement on the building. Being trained in architectural matters, Yaśovīra listed no less than three flaws, one being the orientation of the hall of elephants, which is indeed a very singular feature of this monument (PCi 101. 24 to 102. 8; Tawney 1991: 161f.).

Consequently, the literary texts are worth a reading not only for the information they can provide as for which reasons temples were built and what role they had in the social and political life of medieval times, but also for the way they can complement the technical treatises by telling us by means of which words temples were actually perceived and described by those who lived at the time of their erection.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- HMM *Hammīramadamardana* of Jayasiṃhasūri. Edited by C. D. Dalal. Baroda: Central Library, 1920.
- KVŚ *Kumāravihāraśataka* of Rāmacandra. Edited by Munirāja Haṃsavijaya. Bhāvnagar: Jain Ātmānand Sabhā, 1909.
- KPrat *Kumārapālapratibodha* of Somaprabha. Edited by Munirāja Jinavijaya. Baroda: Central Library, 1920.
- KCS *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1956.
- MRP *Moharājaparājaya* of Yaśaḥpāla. Edited by Muni Chaturvijayaji. Baroda: Central Library, 1918.
- PCa *Prabhāvakarita* of Prabhācandra. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Ahmedabad/Calcutta: Saṃcālaka Singhī Jaina Granthamālā (SJS 13), 1940.
- PCi *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha (SJS 1), 1933.
- TŚPC *Triśaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra* of Hemacandra. Translated by Helen M. Johnson. 6 volumes. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931-1962.

Secondary Sources

Balbir, Nalini. *Dānāṣṭakakathā: Recueil jaina de huit histoires sur le don*. Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 1982.

Bhandarkar, D. R. "The Chahamanas of Marwar." *Epigraphia Indica* 11 (1911-12) 26-79.

Chojnacki, Christine. *Vividhatīrthakalpaḥ: Regards sur le lieu saint jaina*. 2 volumes. Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1995.

Chojnacki, Christine. *Kuvalayamālā*. 2 Volumes. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, 2008.

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

Dagens, Bruno. *Le temple indien, miroir du monde*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2009.

Del Bontà, Robert J. "Digambara Narrative Painting in Southern India." *Victorious Ones: Jain Images of Perfection*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 128-139. New York: Rubin Museum of Art, 2009.

Dhaky, Madhusudan A. "The Western Indian Jaina Temple." *Aspects of Jaina Art and Architecture*. Edited by Umakant P. Shah & Madhusudan A. Dhaky, 319-384. Ahmedabad: Gujarat State Committee for the Celebration of 2500th Anniversary of Bhagavān Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa, 1975.

Dhaky, Madhusudan A. "The Creed-Affiliation of Samiddheśvara Temple in Chittodgadh." *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art* (New Series) 14 (1984-85) 25-42.

Dundas, Paul. *The Jains*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Dundas, Paul. *History, Scripture and Controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Dundas, Paul. "Victorious Across Eternity: The Lives of the Jain Tīrthaṅkaras." *Victorious Ones: Jain Images of Perfection*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 16-33. New York: Rubin Museum of Art, 2009.

Garimella, Annapurna. "A Medieval Tulu Jain Temple in Social Transactions." *Art of Medieval India: Contextualizing Social Relations*. Edited by Shivaji K. Panikkar & Abha Sheth, 65-72. Baroda: The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, 2005.

Glasesnapp, Helmuth von. *Jainism: An Indian Religion of Salvation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1999.

Granoff, Phyllis. "Halāyudha's Prism: The Experience of Religion in Medieval Hymns and Stories." *Gods, Guardians and Lovers: Temple Sculptures from North India A.D. 700-1200*. Edited by Vishakha N. Desai & Darielle Mason, 67-93. New York: The Asia Society Galleries, 1993.

Granoff, Phyllis (ed.). *Victorious Ones: Jain Images of Perfection*. New York: Rubin Museum of Art / Mapin, 2009.

Hardy, Adam. *The Temple Architecture of India*. Chichester: Wiley, 2007.

Hardy, Adam. *Theory and Practice of Temple Architecture in Medieval India: Bhoja's Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra and the Bhojpur Line Drawings*. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts / Dev Publishers, 2015.

Hegewald, Julia A. B. "Aspects of Jaina Temple Architecture in Gujarat and Rajasthan." *South Asia Research* 22, 2 (2002) 107-122.

Hegewald, Julia A. B. *Jaina Temple and Architecture: The Development of a Distinct Language in Space and Ritual*. Berlin: G+H Verlag, 2009a.

Hegewald, Julia A. B. "Sacred Place and Structured Space: Temple Architecture and Pilgrimage in Jainism." *Victorious Ones: Jain Images of Perfection*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 90-109. New York: Rubin Museum of Art / Mapin, 2009b.

Jain, Prem Suman. "The Tale of the Faithful Wife Rohiṇī." *The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 75-83. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1993.

Kielhorn, Franz. "Bhera-Ghāt Stone Inscription of Queen Alhaṇadevī, the Chedi Year 907." *Epigraphia Indica* 2 (1894) 7-16.

Leclère, Basile. "Performance of Sanskrit Theatre in Medieval Gujarat and Rajasthan (From the 11th to the 13th Century)." *Indisches Theater: Text, Theorie, Praxis*. Edited by Karin Steiner & Heidrun Brückner, 27-62. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 2010.

Leclère, Basile. *Le théâtre de l'Inde médiévale entre tradition et innovation: Le Moharājaparājaya de Yaśaḥpāla*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, 2013.

Nanati, J. M. & M. A. Dhaky. *The Maitraka and the Saindhava Temples of Gujarat*. Ascona: Artibus Asiae, 1969.

Patel, Alka. *Building Communities in Gujarāt: Architecture and Society during the Twelfth through Fourteenth Centuries*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004.

Porcher, Marie-Claude. *Figures de style en sanskrit. Théories des alaṃkāraśāstra: Analyse de poèmes de Venkaṭādhvarin*. Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 1978.

Quintanilla, Sonya Rhye. "Icons in the Manifold: Jain Sculpture in Early and Medieval India." *Victorious Ones: Jain Images of Perfection*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 110-127. New York: Rubin Museum of Art / Mapin, 2009.

Sears, Tamara I. *Worldly Gurus and Spiritual Kings: Architecture and Asceticism in Medieval India*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014.

Shah, Umakant P. "Jaina Narrative Literature and Art." *Indologica Taurinensia* 11 (1983) 203-210.

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

Wujastyk, Dominik. "The Love of Kṛṣṇa in Poems and Paintings." *Pearls of the Orient: Asian Treasures from the Wellcome Library*. Edited by Nigel Allan, 86-105. Chicago: Serindia Publications, 2003.