

Devabodha and the Jain Scholars: Friendships and Rivalries at the Caulukya Court

Abstract. It is a well-known fact that several members of the Jain Śvetāmbara community wielded great influence at the Caulukya court during the reigns of kings Jayasiṃha Siddharāja (r. 1094–1142) and Kumārapāla (r. 1142–1172): not only did the great polymath Hemacandra benefit from their patronage and produce many major works on a wide range of subjects, but other Jains were also held in high esteem, like the debater Devasūri or the poet laureate Śrīpāla. What is more unexpected is that, according to Prabhācandra’s *Prabhāvaka-carita* (1278), Devasūri and Hemacandra apparently befriended a Hindu renouncer named Devabodha, the former inviting him to a temple consecration, the latter helping him to pay off his debts. This chapter attempts to understand how and why these friendships might have developed by contrasting them with other friendly or unfriendly relationships known to have existed at the same period.

Keywords. Hinduism, Jainism, medieval India, Prabandhas, friendship

1 Introduction

In the *Prabhāvaka-carita* (*PCa*) or “Deeds of the Exalters of the Doctrine”, completed in 1278, the Jain monk Prabhācandra retold the life stories of twenty-two illustrious Śvetāmbara teachers who spread the Jain doctrine and protected the Jain community. To do so, these monks overcame various kinds of threats, such as the tyranny of a ruler for Kālakasūri, or the supernatural powers of a god for Vīrasūri;¹ more often, however, they had to fight against the representatives of rival communities and the advocates of other creeds in the official and codified context of debate (*vāda*). For instance, the monk Śāntisūri, whose life is narrated in the sixteenth chapter of the *Prabhāvaka-carita*, was known at the court of Caulukya king Bhīma the First (r. 1022–1064) as the “universal sovereign of debaters” (*vādi-cakrin*) and even earned the more impressive and frightening title of

1 Dundas 2002: 130–132; Granoff 1989: 368.

“ghoul for debaters” (*vādi-vetāla*).² In a similar way, the monk Vīrācārya is said, in the twentieth chapter, to have defeated many debaters throughout northern India (Buddhists at Bodh Gayā, other rhetoricians at Gwalior, and so on) before he came to Gujarat, then ruled by Bhīma’s grandson Jayasiṃha Siddharāja (r. 1094–1143). Then a Sāṃkhya master named Vādisiṃha arrived at the court and produced in a spirit of provocation a leaf with a thorny verse written on it,³ but Vīrācārya eventually reduced him to silence in a debate.⁴ In the same period, a freshly ordained monk called Rāmacandra was also touring north-western India in order to challenge the representatives of rival systems and develop his rhetorical skills:

In the city of Dhavalaka, he debated with and won over the Brahmin Dhandha, who preached shaivite non-dualism; in the city of Satyapura, over Sāgara who hailed from Kāśmīr. In the same way he crushed the Digambara Guṇacandra at Nāgapura. At Citrakūṭa came the turn of the Bhāgavata named Śivabhūti. At Gopagiri, it was Gaṅgādhara, at Dhārā, Dharaṇīdhara, at Puṣkariṇī, the Brahmin Padmākara, whose pride was unrestrained in debates. In the illustrious city of Bhṛgukaccha, he won over the Brahmin leader named Kṛṣṇa: this is how Rāmacandra became unrestrained through joy because of his victories in debate on this earth.⁵

Thereafter Rāmacandra was elevated by his teacher Municandrasūri to the dignity of pontiff and given the name of Devasūri, under which he became one of the most famous Śvetāmbara debaters of medieval Gujarat by defeating in 1125 the Digambara teacher Kumudacandra at the Caulukya court.⁶ Another debater Devasūri happened to meet there a few years earlier was the Vaiṣṇava renouncer Devabodha,⁷ and a likely outcome of their encounter would have been a similar

2 *PCa* 16.21, 131.

3 athātra vādisiṃhākhyah sāmkhya-vādī samāgamat | patram pradattavān idṛk likhita-śloka-durghaṭam || (*PCa* 20.37).

4 *PCa* 20.31–32, 61.

5 śaivādvaitam vadan dhandhaḥ pure dhavalake dvijaḥ | kāśmīraḥ sāgaro jigye vādāt satyapure pure || tathā nāgapure kṣuṇṇo guṇacandro digambaraḥ | citrakūṭe bhāgavataḥ śivabhūty-ākhyayā punaḥ || gaṅgādharaḥ gopagirau dhārāyāṃ dharaṇīdharaḥ | padmākaro dvijaḥ puṣkariṇyāṃ vāda-madoddhuraḥ || jītaś ca śrī-bhṛgukṣetre kṛṣṇākhyo brāhmaṇāgraṇīḥ | evaṃ vāda-jayonmudro rāmacandraḥ kṣitāv abhūt || (*PCa* 21.39–42). All the translations from Sanskrit are mine unless specified otherwise. Translations from Latin and French are partly or totally borrowed from the sources mentioned in the bibliography.

6 The narration of the controversy represents the largest part of the account of Devasūri’s life in the twenty-first chapter of the *Prabhāvakaarita*. The event is also known from several other sources, such as a play written by the Jain poet Yaśaścandra a few decades after it took place, the *Mudritakumudacandra*, or “Kumudacandra Reduced to Silence” (on the dating of this text, see Leclère 2013: 27), or another compilation of historical anecdotes, Merutuṅga’s *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, or “Wishing-Stone of Chronicles” (1305).

7 Even though Prabhācandra refers most of the time to Devabodha as a poet (*kavi*), he specifies at the very beginning of the episodes involving him that he was a member and

humiliation of the Jain monk's competition, but in a quite unexpected way they became friends. An even more friendly relationship developed between Devabodha and the great Jain polymath Hemacandrasūri despite the former's open hostility towards the latter's co-religionist Śrīpāla, then chief poet of king Jayasiṃha Siddharāja. After highlighting why Devabodha was entitled to be Devasūri's and Hemacandrasūri's enemy, I will try to figure out what could have led these people to become friends by scrutinising Prabhācandra's account and comparing it with other stories of friendships retold in Indian literature.

2 How Devabodha challenged Jain scholars

In the biographies of both Devasūri and Hemacandrasūri, Devabodha appears as a very learned man (*mahā-vidvān*) who has indulged in arrogance because of his many successes in debates⁸ and who comes to the Caulukya court at Patan to challenge the scholars attached to Jayasiṃha Siddharāja. In Devasūri's biography, he hangs on the door of the royal palace a leaf bearing a verse that is barely comprehensible even to wise men, strongly recalling Vādisiṃha's appearance some years earlier.⁹ In Hemacandra's biography, Devabodha also emulates Vādisiṃha's provocative attitude when he asks the king to come and sit on the ground while he is himself installed on a royal throne,¹⁰ and immediately manifests his hostility towards the chief poet of the Caulukya court, the Jain layman Śrīpāla, and his intention to remove him from his position: "Who is that man unfit for this assembly,' he said while pointing at the king of poets with his hand."¹¹ Jayasiṃha Siddharāja then details the literary achievements of his favourite, but Devabodha, far from

even a leader of the Bhāgavata community (cf. Leclère 2016: 517; also footnote 9 below). An allusion to Devabodha's initiation as a renouncer (*yati*) can also be found in the *Prabhāvakaṛita*: the spies sent out by Śrīpāla to gain information about his enemy's behaviour report that the Brahmin Devabodha burned his sacred thread and drank water from the Ganges when he took the vow of the Bhāgavatas: veda-garbhah soma-pīthī dagdhvā yajñopavitakam | apibad gāṅga-nīreṇa prātta-bhāgavata-vrataḥ || (*PCa* 22.240). Consequently, he was supposed to conform to the rules of conduct associated with the renunciators' stage of life (*yaty-āśrama*, *PCa* 22.241).

⁸ Śrīdharadāsa quotes in the section titled "Pride of the Talented Ones" (*guṇi-garvaḥ*) of his poetic anthology *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (1205) a verse extolling with much emphasis the eloquence of Devabodha. For a translation, see Leclère 2016: 494.

⁹ anyadā devabodhākhyah śrī-bhāgavata-darśanī | bhūri-vāda-jayonmudrah śrī-pattanam āyayau || avalambata patram ca rāja-dvāre madoddhurah | tatra ślokaṃ durālokaṃ vibudhair alikhac ca saḥ || (*PCa* 21.61–62)

¹⁰ *PCa* 20.43; 21.193.

¹¹ parśado'nucitaḥ ko'yam iti hastena darśite kavi-rāje (*PCa* 22.203).

showing more respect, makes fun of Śrīpāla's blindness in a satirical verse.¹² As a logical consequence, Śrīpāla is incensed and starts to investigate,¹³ soon discovering through his spies that his rival's behaviour is not beyond reproach: despite his vows, he goes to the shore of the Sarasvatī River by night and drinks alcohol there with his followers.¹⁴ Śrīpāla denounces him to Jayasiṃha Siddharāja, who resolves to go and see all this with his own eyes, but Devabodha notices his presence and spontaneously offers him a cup filled with a liquid looking like milk.¹⁵ He thus dispels quite successfully suspicions about his morality, and when he pretends the day after to leave the country, he is begged by the king not to do so. Śrīpāla thus does not get his revenge but finds another opportunity to do so three years later when Devabodha finds himself overwhelmed with debt.¹⁶

One might expect that Devabodha would have then met the same ignominious fate as other unbearably arrogant teachers. For instance, Vādisiṃha was thrown to the ground by Jayasiṃha Siddharāja himself and would have gone to jail had Vīrācārya not asked the king to set him free.¹⁷ However, both Devasūri and Hemacandra behaved towards Devabodha in an even more charitable and friendly way than Vīrācārya did towards Vādisiṃha.

3 Two benevolent Jain monks

After six months of fruitless efforts by the scholars of the Caulukya court to solve Devabodha's riddle, Devasūri arrives and successfully unfolds the meanings of the verse in a prose commentary that Prabhācandra inserted in his work. By doing so, not only did he win the friendship of the king,¹⁸ but he also became a subject of esteem for Devabodha: when they met later on at Nāgapura, Devabodha paid his respects to Devasūri and composed a stanza in *āryā* metre to celebrate him.¹⁹ Moreover, it is said in Hemacandra's biography that Devasūri invited Devabodha

12 *PCa* 22.204–208; cf. Parikh 1938: cclix; Sandesara 1964: 253 n. 3.

13 *āprāk tadīya-vairasyāt śrīpālo'pi kṛti-prabhuḥ | vṛttāny anveṣayaty asyāsūyā-garbha-manā manāk ||* (*PCa* 22.237).

14 *asau yaty-āśramābhāsācāraḥ sārāsvate taṭe | niśīthe sva-parīvāra-vṛtaḥ pibati vāruṇim ||* (*PCa* 22.241).

15 *PCa* 22.260–262. It is not clear whether the king is given a cup of real milk or if the renouncer has used some sort of magic to turn alcohol into another kind of beverage.

16 *PCa* 22.277–278.

17 *PCa* 20.61, 67.

18 *rājñā mataḥ suhṛt* (*PCa* 21.66). The affection of the king for the teacher can be seen later in the text when Jayasiṃha considers that he cannot seize the fortress of Nāgapura as long as his friend Devasūri stays within its walls: *madhya-sthite'tra tan-mitre durgam lātuṃ na śakyate* (*PCa* 21.79).

19 *PCa* 21.75–76.

to the consecration of a Jain temple he had built after his victory over Kumudacandra:

At another time, the illustrious Devasūri won the debate, and the king gave him a sum of money out of joy; the monk withdrew one lakh from the total, and with the remaining sum he had a Jain temple elevated; then he cared for the organisation of the great festival called the installation of the flag, and, besides the king who came there with him, he was happy to invite Devabodha himself as someone deserving gifts, because they were the same as regards religion.²⁰

What is particularly remarkable here is the fact that Devabodha is considered by an eminent Jain monk a “good recipient” for gifts (*sat-pātra*), although according to Jain theoreticians a person deprived of the correct belief (*samyaktva*)—that is, the Jain faith—is usually considered a “poor recipient” (*ku-pātra*) if he has some morality or a “wrong recipient” (*a-pātra*) if he indulges in vices such as drinking alcohol.²¹

As regards the much more serious rivalry between Śrīpāla and Devabodha, it was unexpectedly settled by Hemacandrasūri: “The master then called Śrīpāla over and made him have affection for Devabodha; it is the first duty of ascetics to pacify quarrels.”²² The outcome of the story is all the more surprising since Śrīpāla had requested support from Hemacandra in his attempt to kick Devabodha out of the Caulukya court,²³ and the Śvetāmbara teacher should have been on his side as they had the same belief. Indeed, it was expected from any member of the Jain community to feel an affectionate fraternity towards their co-religionists (*sādharmika-vātsalya*).²⁴ With no regard to Śrīpāla’s request, Hemacandra rather welcomes Devabodha, makes him understand that he knows all about his financial problems, and persuades the king into giving him one lakh to pay off his debts.²⁵

20 anyadā śrī-devasūri-jīta-vāda-kṣaṇe mudā | datte vitte narendrena lakṣa-saṃkhye tad-uddhṛte || aparenāpi vittena jaina-prāsāda unnate | vidhāpīte dhvajārōpa-vidhānākhyamahāmahe || *devabodho*’pi sat-pātraṃ tatrāhūyata harṣataḥ | samāyātena bhūpena dharme te syuḥ samā yataḥ || (*PCa* 22.222–224; cf. Parikh 1938: cclix).

21 The distinction between good and bad recipients is strongly stressed by the Śvetāmbara monk Somaprabha in the *Kumārāpālapratibodha*, or “Awakening of King Kumārāpāla”, a didactic work in Prakrit completed in 1185 (cf. Balbir 1982: 85–86). The full list of three or, if the undesirable ones are included, five types of recipients can be found in treatises written by Digambara authors between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries (Williams 1963: 17, 150–153).

22 tataḥ śrīpālam ākāryāsnehayat tena sa prabhuḥ | ādyo dharmo vrata-sthānām virodhopaśamaḥ || (*PCa* 22.306). The second part of the translation is borrowed from Parikh 1938: cclx.

23 *PCa* 22.278–286.

24 Chojnacki 2011: 211–213.

25 *PCa* 22.307–308. Nobody else than a friend helps people when they are in distress, as expressed in a stanza inserted in the second book of the *Pañcatantra*: sarveṣām eva

4 Esteem and mutual fascination as basis for friendship

What can account for the friendly behaviour of the Jain monks? First, these monks perfectly illustrate the equanimity which members of their community are striving to reach. But it is also clear that these friendly relations are grounded on esteem for intellectual abilities. If Devabodha pays his respects to Devasūri, it is probably out of consideration for the brightness the latter displayed in elucidating his enigmatic stanza, and Devasūri himself may have appreciated the subtlety of Devabodha's stanza when elaborating on its gloss. As regards Hemacandra, he admits that Śrīpāla speaks the truth when he criticises Devabodha's unbearable pride, but he nonetheless keeps in mind his qualities:

Then the spiritual master said: "What you said is just that way, but there is one quality of this man we hold in high esteem, and not any other. In this epoch, no-one else than this man can display such a unique and complete eloquence which is even more increased by the quality of transference. That is the reason why this wise man must be given a hospitable reception if he comes to me with no more pride, like a snake deprived of venom."²⁶

That Devabodha was eloquent is amply testified by many stanzas attributed to him in the *Prabhāvākacārīta*, and his poetic style remained in fashion long after his death, as proven by the quotation of several other stanzas of his in anthologies from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But what Hemacandra is precisely alluding to here is the capacity Devabodha had to transfer his eloquence even to someone of poor education. Not only does Prabhācandra underline this quality from the outset of the account, but Devabodha himself displays it at court when he makes a buffalo-driver who does not know more than two syllables recite a verse simply by touching his head with his hand.²⁷

This recalls the way Hemacandra inspired friendship to Jayasiṃha's cousin and successor Kumārapāla (r. 1142–1172): according to Merutuṅga's *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi* (*PCi*), a famous compilation of chronicles from the beginning of the

martyānām vyaṣane samupasthite | vān-mātreṇāpi sāhāyyaṃ mitrād anyo na saṃdadhe (frame story, v. 12, p. 99). Assistance (*upakāra*) is one of the causes of attachment enumerated by the tenth-century theoretician Bhoja when he describes the different types of friends who can act as messengers (*dūta*) between two lovers in the twenty-eighth chapter of the *Śrīngāraprakāśa*, or "Light on the Erotic Sentiment". Knowing about someone's secrets (*rahasyāni*) and weak points (*marmāni*) also appears in the list (cf. Raghavan 1963: 52).

26 athocur guravo yūyaṃ yaj jalpata tad eva tat | ekatrāsya guṇe nas tu bahumānaḥ paratra naḥ || dr̥ṣyate'nanya-sāmānyam sāmkrāmika-guṇottaram | sārasvatam na kutrāpi samaye asminn amuṃ vinā || tato'sau nirviṣaḥ sarpa iva ced āgamiṣyati | mlānamānaḥ kuto dhīmān labhya'nenāpi satkr̥tiḥ || (*PCa* 22.287–289).

27 *PCa* 22.182, 229–236, cf. Parikh 1938: cclx.

fourteenth century, Kumārapāla had his heart charmed or seized by the monk's qualities (*guṇa*),²⁸ and for that reason he openly strived for friendship with Hemacandra²⁹ and kept on cultivating it despite the “innate jealousy” of the Hindu ascetics from the Tripuruṣa temple,³⁰ the “hostility” of the king's chaplain, the Brahmin Āliga,³¹ and the enmity of the courtiers who could not stand the monk's accumulation of glory and spread calumnies about him.³² As said Cicero in his treatise on friendship, “there is indeed nothing more lovable than virtue, nothing which leads more than virtue to an affection deliberately chosen”,³³ and thus the outstanding intellectual and moral qualities displayed by Hemacandra not only captivated Kumārapāla but also proved to be the firmest foundation for their friendship.³⁴

But there is one more factor that can account for the friendship between the Jain monks and the Hindu renouncer, something like identification or mutual fascination. That is at least what Prabhācandra seems to have pointed at by making use of the same expressions to qualify these characters. Remarkably enough, Devabodha is presented right away as “unrestrained through joy because of his many victories in debate”, with the same sophisticated compound that Prabhācandra has previously applied to Devasūri when dealing with his victories as a freshly ordained monk.³⁵ But if we now consider the relationship between Devabodha and Hemacandra, it is even more flagrant that the Hindu renouncer and the Jain monk are reflected in each other, especially in the denouement of the story, when Hemacandra heartily welcomes Devabodha with many compliments.

28 tad-guṇa-rañjita-hṛdā (*PCi* 82.20); śrī-hemacandrasya lokottarair guṇaiḥ pariḥṛta-hṛdayo nṛpo (*PCi* 83.1); tad-guṇair unmīlan-nīlīrāga-rakta-hṛdayas tam ekam eva saṃsadi praśaṣaṃsa saḥ (*PCi* 84.16–17). The king's heart is literally coloured (*rañjita* or *rakta*, from *rañj*, “to be dyed”) by a feeling which is referred to in the last quotation by the very expressive term of *nīlī-rāga*, “an affection as unchangeable as the colour of indigo.”

29 bhavadbhiḥ saha maitryam abhilaṣāmi (*PCi* 82.1). Kumārapāla justifies his affection for the monk by quoting a verse stating that “it does not matter whether one's friend be a king or a hermit” (ekam mitram bhūpatir vā yatir vā); see *PCi* 81.28, translated by Tawney 1991: 124.

30 sahaja-mātsaryād (*PCi* 81.20).

31 virodha (*PCi* 82.4). The name of the chaplain is also spelled Āmiga in some manuscripts and secondary sources (see Tawney 1991: 125; Parikh 1938: ccxxx) but I follow the lesson selected by the editor Jinavijaya Muni (as did Majumdar 1956: 316–317).

32 nirmimitta-vairi-pariḥṛta tat-tejah-puñjam asahiṣṇuḥ [. . .] tad-apavadān avādīt (*PCi* 84.17, 19).

33 Nihil est enim virtute amabilius, nihil quod magis adliciat ad diligendum (*De amicitia* 8.28, p. 73).

34 In Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* (eighth century), it is also because of Lava's impressive qualities (in the art of fighting) that Candraketu feels affection for him and calls him his friend, without knowing they actually are cousins: atyadbhutād api guṇātiśayāt priyo me | tasmāt sakhā tvam asi yan mama tat tavaiva (*Uttararāmacarita*, fifth act, v. 10).

35 bhūri-vāda-jayonmudra (*PCa* 21.61); vāda-jayonmudra (*PCa* 21.42); cf. footnote 5 above.

When he heard that, Devabodha thought: “This man knows my vulnerable point. But whether he has learned it from a report or thanks to an art that goes beyond report, we don’t know. In any way he is a great scholar endowed with strength by the good fortune he has received in share. What jealousy can exist towards someone that pure? On the contrary he inspires the high esteem which gives rise to pure things! In the current period, who is equal to him as regards merit and science? Who is his rival in qualities? Therefore, it is suitable to be sincere.” Then that clever man sat on the half of seat offered by Hemacandra, and as he was thinking in his mind that the monk was the goddess Sarasvatī under a male form, he who was shining with his supreme eloquence uttered in a surprising way a speech that made the body hair of the audience bristle with joy like grass when comes a thick rainy cloud. It was as follows: “May he protect you, Hemacandra the herdsman who bears a blanket and a staff, and who makes the cattle of the six Hindu philosophical systems graze in the Jain pasture.”³⁶ When they heard this stanza in *śloka* metre and the right meaning it fully developed, the members of the assembly shook their head with joy and felt an unequalled surprise.³⁷

The Vaiṣṇava renouncer whose knowledge is constantly underlined throughout the text by means of various expressions³⁸ acknowledges that the Jain monk himself is a great scholar as well,³⁹ and he holds him in the same esteem that Hemacandra expresses about his own eloquence.⁴⁰ Even more, Devabodha states that nobody can be compared to Hemacandra in the current time as far as merit and science are concerned—which not only reminds of the monk’s well-known title of Kalikāla-sarvajña, or “Omniscient of the Kali Age”, but also of the praise Hemacandra gave of Devabodha’s exceptional mastery over eloquence.⁴¹ Besides, Devabodha considers Hemacandra as the goddess Sarasvatī herself in male form, which is very relevant given that eloquence (*sārasvata*, literally “the gift of Sarasvatī”) is

36 This stanza is also quoted in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, where it is attributed to a poet from Banaras named Viśveśvara. He uttered the first *pāda* with the intention of mocking Hemacandra, but quickly added the second *pāda* of more eulogistic meaning when he saw the king looking at him angrily (*PCi* 89.4–8).

37 śrutveti devabodho’pi dadhyau me marma vetty asau | kathanāt kathanāṭita-kalāto vā na vidmahe || yathātāthā mahā-vidvān asau bhāgya-śriyorjitaḥ | atra ko matsarah svacche bahumānaḥ śubhodayaḥ || samaye’dyatane ko’sya samānaḥ puṇya-vidyayoh | guṇeṣu kaḥ pratidvandvī tasmāt prāñjalatocitā || athopāviśad etenānumate’rddhāsane kṛtī | manasā manyamānaś ca puṃ-rūpāṃ tām sarasvatīm || savismayaṃ giraṃ prāha sāra-sārasvatojjvalaḥ | pārśadya-pulakāṅkūra-ghanāghana-ghana-prabhām || tathā hi pātu vo hema-gopālaḥ kambalaṃ daṇḍam udvahan | ṣaḍ-darśana-paśu-grāmaṃ cārayan jainagocare || vyādhūta-śiraśaḥ ślokaṃ eṇaṃ sāmajikā hṛdā | śrutvā satyārtha-puṣṭim ca te’tulaṃ vismayaṃ daduḥ || (*PCa* 22.299–305).

38 mahāvidvān (*PCa* 22.182, 185); viduṣām nātho (*PCa* 22.233); dhīmān (*PCa* 21.289); vidvan-koṭīra (*PCa* 22.297).

39 mahāvidvān (*PCa* 22.300).

40 bahumāna (*PCa* 22.287, 300); cf. footnote 26 above.

41 *PCa* 22.288, 301.

precisely the quality he is admired for.⁴² But what expresses in the most striking way the perfect friendship that Hemacandra and Devabodha experienced is, in my opinion, the fact that they eventually sat each on one half of the same seat: it looks as if, at that moment, their bodies became the two halves of one single person, in the same way as the souls of true friends, as Montaigne noted, “mix and work themselves into one piece, with so universal a mixture, that there is no more sign of the seam by which they were first conjoined”.⁴³

5 Conclusion

Admittedly, these anecdotes are intended to highlight the remarkable detachment of the Jain teachers who appear as the only renunciators truly liberated from the passions. It also points at the ecumenical approach of Jainism which subsumes other creeds: that is what Hemacandra himself taught in the parable of the man changed into a bull by his wife,⁴⁴ and that is also the meaning of the eulogistic verse Devabodha pronounced at the end of the story.⁴⁵ However, they also suggest that friendship was not confined within the boundaries of each community, or determined by long familiarity,⁴⁶ but that it could also appear when outstanding

42 *PCa* 22.302–303. When reporting how Devabodha completed four incomplete stanzas (*samasyā*) in a row (the first one given by Śrīpāla, the three others proposed by himself as better examples), Prabhācandra adds: “Indeed, how the poetic talent could be slow for those who are endowed with perfect eloquence” (*siddha-sarasvatānām hi vilamba-kavitā kutaḥ*, *PCa* 22.217). Śrīpāla himself is styled as “endowed with perfect eloquence” (*siddha-sārasvataḥ kaviḥ*, *PCa* 22.247), suggesting some deeper affinity with the Hindu poet which somehow accounts for their final reconciliation.

43 Noted in the chapter “Of Friendship” from the first book of his *Essays*. Montaigne also refers to the Aristotelian definition of friendship as “one soul in two bodies” (Montaigne 1902, vol. 1: 220, 223).

44 *PCi* 70.9–26.

45 *PCa* 22.304; cf. footnote 37 above.

46 For instance, Śrīpāla was already Jayasiṃha Siddharāja’s friend when a child, according to Yaśaścandra’s *Mudritakumudacandra* (*siddha-bhūpala-bāla-mitram*; cf. Sandesara 1964: 253), and in a similar way, the unnatural friendship that existed between the Caulukya king Ajayapāla (r. 1172–1176), a notorious adversary of the Jain faith, and Hemacandra’s own disciple Bālacandra is traced back to their childhood by the fifteenth-century Jain poet Jayasiṃhasūri (*ābāla-kāla-suhrde’jayapālāya*, *Kumārapālabhūpālacaritamahākāvya* 10.118). Amicable or hostile feelings could even be explained by events that had happened in previous lives: for instance, Jayasiṃhasūri states that Kumārapāla and Hemacandra had already met in a previous existence. Kumārapāla was then a bandit named Jayatāka who took flight when attacked by a merchant whose caravan he had robbed earlier. He was wandering in misery when he came across a Jain monk named Yaśobhadra—the previous incarnation of Hemacandra’s soul—who gave him provisions and later initiated him into the Jain cult. The story also accounts for Jayasiṃha Siddharāja’s hatred towards Kumārapāla since

individuals acknowledged the merits and qualities of people who should have been their innate enemies.⁴⁷

These friendships may have looked scandalous in the eyes of posterity, and in a most noteworthy way Prabhācandra himself justified the behaviour of Devasūri and Hemacandrasūri by stating that it was conform to the conduct expected of people who had taken religious vows. As for later authors, they may have decided not to report these stories either because they considered it inappropriate to do so, or even because they just could not believe them. The unknown author of a *mahākāvya* devoted to Devasūri deliberately ignored Devabodha even though his work echoes in many other respects the information provided by Prabhācandra; and the Vaiṣṇava renouncer became the antagonist of Hemacandra in the biographies of Jayasiṃha Siddharāja's successor Kumārapāla: they all portrayed Devabodha as a champion of Hinduism invested with the mission of cancelling the king's conversion to the Jain creed.⁴⁸

In any case, Prabhācandra has preserved a remarkably interesting testimony on the way friendship can grow across the boundaries of religious communities. Besides, it is quite moving to consider that Devabodha benefited from Jain monks' friendship not only during his lifetime but even after his death. Indeed, most of the information we have about his existence comes from the corpus of the Jain Prābandhas. Had he not met with Devasūri and Hemacandra he would probably have sunk into almost total oblivion. Such a friendship that has endured beyond death and over so many centuries does deserve to be ranked among the rare instances of true friendships Cicero talked about in his treatise.

the former was the owner of the caravan plundered by the latter (*Kumārapālabhūpālacaritamahākāvya* 10.68–70).

47 Such an unexpected affection is remarkably exemplified by the crow Laghupatanaka and the rat Hiranyaka in the frame story of the second book of the *Pañcatantra*: the former is very impressed by the latter's intelligence (aho buddhir asya hiranyakasya) and eagerly wants to become his friend, but Hiranyaka at first declines, as he is a prey (*bhojyabhūta*) and Laghupatanaka a predator (*bhoktr*); however, he eventually agrees when he realises, after a long discussion, that the crow looks clever as well (vidagdha-vacano'yaṃ dṛṣyate laghupatanakaḥ satya-vākyaś ca). Their intimacy subsequently develops to the point that Laghupatanaka introduces Hiranyaka to another friend of his as "his second life" (hiranyako nāma mūṣako'yaṃ | mama suhrd dviṭīyam iva jīvitam). See Viṣṇuśarman 2008: 102, 105, 107).

48 Cf. Leclère 2016: 504.

References

- Balbir, Nalini (1982): *Dānāṣṭakakathā. Recueil jaina de huit histoires sur le don*. Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne.
- Chojnacki, Christine (2011): “Shifting Communities in Early Jain Prabandha Literature: Sectarian Attitudes and Emergent Identities”. *Studies in History* 27.2: 197–219.
- De amicitia* of Marcus Tullius Cicero (1902): Edited by Clifton Price. New York: American Book Company.
- Dundas, Paul (2002): *The Jains*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Granoff, Phyllis (1989): “The Biographies of Siddhasena: A Study in the Texture of Allusion and the Weaving of a Group-Image (Part I)”. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 17: 329–384.
- Kumārapālābhūpālacaritamahākāvya* of Jayasiṃhasūri (1926): Edited by Shah Bhaichand Naginbhai Manchhubhai / Shah Manilal Motilal Mulji. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press.
- Leclère, Basile (2013): *Le théâtre de l’Inde médiévale entre tradition et innovation: le Moharājaparājaya de Yaśaḥpāla*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica.
- Leclère, Basile (2016): “New Light on Devabodha, the Earliest Extant Commentator on *Mahābhārata*”. *Asiatische Studien / Etudes Asiatiques* 70.2: 489–526.
- Majumdar, A. K. (1956): *Chaulukyās of Gujarat*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Montaigne, Michel de (1902): *Essays*. 4 vols. Translated by Charles Cotton. Edited by William Carey Hazlitt. London: Reeves and Turner.
- Parikh, Rasilklal C. (1938): “Introduction”. In: *Kavyānuśāsana by Āchārya Hemacandra*. Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīra Jain Vidyālaya, i–cccxxx.
- Pañcatantra* of Viṣṇuśarman (2008): Edited by Moreshvar Ramchandra Kale. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- PCa = Prabhāvākācarita* of Prabhācandra (1940): Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Ahmedabad/Calcutta: Singhī Jaina Granthamālā.
- PCi = Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga (1933): Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha.
- Raghavan, Venkataram (1963): *Bhoja’s Śrṅgāra Prakāśa*. Madras: Punarvasu.
- Sandesara, Bhogilal J. (1964): “Śrīpāla: The Blind Poet-Laureate at the Court of Siddharāja Jayasiṃha (1094–1143 A.D.) and Kumārapāla (1143–1174 A.D.) of Gujarāt”. *Journal of the Oriental Institute* 13: 252–259.
- Tawney, Charles Henry (transl.) (1991): *The Prabandhacintāmaṇi, or Wishing-Stone of Narratives*. Delhi: Sagar Book House.
- Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti (1968): Translated as *La Dernière Aventure de Rāma*. and annotated by Nadine Stchoupak. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Williams, Richard (1963): *Jaina Yoga*. London: Oxford University Press.

