

Jaina-Prosopography II

“Patronage” in Jaina Epigraphic and Manuscript Catalogues

Peter Flügel¹

While case-studies still offer the most fruitful avenue toward understanding the specific religious and political motives and intentions informing the dissemination of Jaina ideas through the activities of itinerant mendicant orders, artefacts such as texts and temples, and events, broader patterns of patronage of Jaina religious ideas can only be discovered through comprehensive prosopographical datasets, which will form the basic tools for future historical and sociological investigations. This article explores the possibilities and present limitations of studying patterns of patronage in the Jaina tradition through re-analysis of data published in manuscript and epigraphic catalogues with the help of new prosopographical methods, using relational data-bases. The empirical focus will be a case study of references expressly pertaining to “patronage” in J. Klatt’s (2016) *Jaina-Onomasticon*. The article forms part of a series of research papers connected with the current development of a *Jaina-Prosopography* database by the Centre of Jaina Studies (CoJS) in the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London. The first article on the “Sociology of Jaina Names” discussed problems of identification of persons and of the coding of Jaina names.² In the present, second, article, the difficulties of coding “patronage” relationships will be addressed. In a third publication, the settled coding scheme of the Jaina-Prosopography database will be published, together with the data-model, which is being developed in collaboration by the Digital Humanities Institute (DHI) in Sheffield.³

1. Digital Humanities and Jaina Studies

The lack of computer-supported analyses of already existing large sets of complex data has been felt for some time in South Asian Studies, most clearly in the fields of Indian epigraphy⁴ and manuscriptology. Considerable progress has been made in recent years in the fields of library science, development of electronic repositories for primary and secondary sources,⁵ manuscript digitisation, and text encoding.⁶ Some of the resulting datasets are prosopographically oriented, and have produced meta-data for cataloguing defined sets of primary and secondary sources or used TEI coding categories for the analysis of transcribed Indic manuscripts.⁷ However, “new-style” prosopographical databases⁸ for the examination of populations of individuals sharing certain characteristics with the help of sets of defined variables have not yet been developed in South Asian Studies.⁹

¹ Research for this article was funded through Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant RPG-2016-454. I would like to thank Christine Chojnacki and Basile Leclère for their invitation to the conference *The Constitution of a Literary Legacy and the Tradition of Patronage in Jainism* on 15-17 September 2016 in Lyon, and for their perceptive comments on an earlier version of this article. Extensive discussions with Kornelius Krümpelmann, J.C. Wright, Renate Söhnen-Thieme, and other contributors to the *Jaina-Prosopography* project helped shaping the contents of the article. Katherine Keats-Rohan and Oskar von Hinüber have kindly read and commented on the penultimate draft and offered very useful suggestions.

² Flügel 2018a.

³ Developed by Michael Pidd & Katherine Rogers.

⁴ “Most urgent is the need for comprehensive computer databases of the now unmanageably vast published epigraphic material; very little has been done in this direction, and the need for it is growing constantly” (Salomon 1998: 224). “[T]he epigraphical record [...] awaits systematic study” (Pollock 2006: 232).

⁵ Several useful online repositories for inscriptions such as *EpiDoc* and *SIDDHAM: The South Asia Inscriptions Database* have been established. The *National Mission for Manuscripts* (NMM) in India has also great potential. For electronic texts converted into Roman script the *Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages* (GRETIL) has to be mentioned.

⁶ For instance the Text Encoding Initiatives (TEI) associated with SARIT: sarit.indology.info.

⁷ See for instance the database produced by the collaborative project of the Punjab University Library, Lahore, Pakistan, Geumgang University, Nonsan, Korea and the Department of South Asian Studies, University of Vienna, 2010: <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/woolner>.

⁸ On the term “new-style prosopography” see Bradley & Short 2005: 5, who make the case for the use of relational data-bases, as well as for their own “factoid-” centred approach, employed, for example, by Beam et al. PoMS 2012, Jeffrey PBW 2016. See also Keats-Rohan 2007a: 12f. Examples of “new-style” prosopographies are the *China Biographical Database (CBDB)* of Hartwell et al. 2017, and the database *Continental Origins of English Landholders (COEL)* of Keats-Rohan 2001.

⁹ Instructions for the coding of “patron” or “patronage,” etc., are not included in the general TEI guidelines either: <http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/de/html/index.html>

Although the uses of databases has increased, the traditional “old-style” prosopographical objectives of bibliography,¹⁰ collective biography, and demography¹¹ still dominate research agendas in the Humanities.

K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (2007b) has summarised the distinctive features of the “new” prosopographical method¹² as follows:

“To spell it out: prosopography examines a population that shares one or more characteristic. The population is isolated from source material according to carefully defined criteria and the data concerning it are collected and modelled according to equally carefully defined criteria. Whilst every effort is made to identify individuals among the subject population, the focus is not on the individual per se but upon the total collection of individuals in aggregate. Analysis is thus based on the whole group considered with reference to its constituent parts; the object is to examine the interplay between a set of variables in order to understand certain historical processes, and not to create some sort of composite individual intended to represent the whole.

Collective or comparative biography is not based upon rigorously established selection criteria and the focus remains the individual. It is therefore not prosopography. In collective biography the subjects are selected by the compiler towards an end; in other words, the group is created by the compiler for his own didactic purposes. In a prosopography the number and identity of individuals who compose the group (population) is not usually known at first, because the group is selected as the starting point of an inquiry by the researcher, whose purpose is to discover and to learn. To this extent at least we can distinguish collective biography and prosopography in terms of a subjective and an objective approach” (pp. 143f.).

Because relational databases are predicated on prior compilations of data from primary sources, collective biographies, epigraphic catalogues, and other collations of “raw” data are necessary preconditions of computer-supported research. From this perspective, “old-style” prosopographical studies can be described as *first-stage prosopographies* and contrasted with *second-stage prosopographies*, that is, databases operating with tightly defined sets of analytical codes for the analysis of existing collections of data.¹³ The prevalent label “new-style prosopography” does not cater for the fact that existing “first-stage” prosopographical datasets are essential for “second-stage” analyses. Although data collection and coding are defined as two clearly demarcated stages, the coding-frames broadly envisaged for “second-stage” prosopographical databases inevitably exert an influence on data collection from the outset. If this procedure would be an essential condition for quantitative analysis, “first-stage” datasets would not qualify as sources for quantitative analysis. But this is not necessarily the case, as this article will also show.

In the field of Jaina Studies, database-supported research is an entirely new development.¹⁴ The collaborative research project *Jaina-Prosopography: Monastic Lineages, Networks and Patronage* at the Centre of Jaina Studies of the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London is the first of its

¹⁰ See for instance Beach 2017, Lilie, Ludwig, Zielke & Pratsch 2017.

¹¹ Pioneering “prosopographical” work on medieval Christian nuns in England by Oliva 1995 offers demographic statistics based on biographical data collated in spreadsheets, while Greatrex 1999 still used pen and pencil for similar purposes.

¹² Inspired, not least, by the work of Bourdieu 1979.

¹³ Flügel 2018a. Katherine Keats-Rohan (e-mail 20.1.2018) agrees with this conclusion, not least because the label “new style prosopography” is often narrowly identified with the “factoid” approach.

¹⁴ The first project intended for computer analysis, was the work of K. Bruhn, C. B. Tripathi and B. Bhatt on the “Jaina Concordance and Bhāṣya Concordance,” on which see Bruhn and Tripathi 1977. In the end, for “philological reasons,” computers were not used after all. The resulting card catalogue, the *Berliner Konkordanz*, is now hosted by the British Library. See Flügel 2017c. Pioneering work has since been produced by Moriichi Yamazaki and Yumi Ousaka of the Chūō Academic Research Institute in Tokyo on the “Automatic Analysis of the Canon in Middle Indo-Aryan by Personal Computer.” See Ousaka, Yamazaki & Miyao 1994, 1996 and Yamazaki & Ousaka 1999.

kind.¹⁵ Following the lead of the proto-prosopographical¹⁶ work of Johannes Klatt, who, due to ill health, was not able to cross-link the complex set of bio-bibliographical data he had compiled, if ever he intended to do so, the *Jaina-Prosopography* assembles information excerpted from already published sources, mainly epigraphic and manuscript catalogues, as well as meta-catalogues, such as Klatt's, but using a relational database, rather than paper slips, as used by cataloguers in the past.¹⁷

With the advent of advanced digital technology, the combination of (bio-) bibliographic and sociological research, envisaged by Ilse Bry (1977) in her book *The Emerging Field of Sociobibliography*,¹⁸ has become an exciting new avenue for research. Sociobibliography and prosopography in the age of electronic data promise to revolutionise the way in which (meta-) catalogues are used and created. In digitised form, the aggregate data embedded in expertly produced catalogues can be used for historical and sociological analysis on a large-scale, by a multitude of research projects, if supplemented by additional biographical and contextual historical information from other sources.¹⁹

The integration of information compiled from different already existing printed and digital data-sets will facilitate the discovery of new patterns of relationships between itinerant Jaina mendicants, their families of origin, lineages, networks, patrons, literatures, religious sites, and contextual social, political and geographic configurations. The contents of stage-two prosopographical databases can be analysed in a variety of ways with modern digital technology to explore links between previously disconnected pieces of information. A prosopographical database can also be used simply to find out information on one or other item of interest.

Prosopographical databases are a particularly useful tool for the study of Jaina history, because of the prevalence of "stereotyped themes and structures"²⁰ in the Jaina sources,²¹ which lend themselves to computerised analysis.

¹⁵ The project runs from 2017 to 2021 and is funded through Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant RPG-2016-454. For details and updates see <https://www.soas.ac.uk/jaina-prosopography> and Flügel 2017b, 2018a,

¹⁶ According to Keats-Rohan 2007b: 25 an onomasticon has "a single entry for a single personal name, with appended references to numerous occurrences of it, whereas a prosopographical lexicon will contain as many entries for the same personal name as the research has indicated there are separate bearers of it, often distinguished by the addition of a number." In view of these criteria, Klatt's (1892) 2016 *Jaina-Onomasticon* is a proto-prosopographical work, not just a list of names. See Flügel 2016: 125.

¹⁷ On Klatt's work-routine, see Flügel 2016: 71-4.

¹⁸ Referred to by Bruhn 1981: 40 Fn. 62 in the context of a discussion of categorizing the contents of publications in terms of "misleading titles."

¹⁹ See Zysk 2012 for a kindred, but different approach toward "The Use of Manuscript Catalogues as Sources of Regional Intellectual History in India's Early Modern Period."

²⁰ Dundas 2007: 63f.

²¹ Bühler 1887/1903: 48 was one of the authors to point to the formulaic nature of Jaina inscriptions

"The formulae of the inscriptions are almost universally the same. First comes the date, then follows the name of a reverend teacher, next, the mention of the school and the subdivision of it to which he belonged. Then the persons, who dedicated the statues are named (mostly women), and who belonged to the community of the said teacher. The description of the gift forms the conclusion."

His observation is echoed by Stoler Miller 1992: 4, again with reference to the Jaina inscriptions at Mathurā:

"The formulaic inscriptions on these finds usually begin with a date followed by the name of the donor's teacher and his sect. Then the donor and his relatives are mentioned, as well as the name of the monk or nun at whose advice the gift was made. The gift, whether an image of a Jina (a Jain saint), a temple, a votive tablet or a gateway is generally called *dāna*, though sometimes the purpose of the gift is also mentioned, such as 'for the worship of the Jina'. Rarely is a gift said to be for the donor's spiritual welfare or for the welfare of the community, references which are common in later periods. The identification of donors includes a metal-worker and a merchant, but mainly the wives of various tradesmen and craftsmen. The Jaina evidence is consonant with the analysis of Buddhist patronage by Romila Thapar, Vidya Dehejia and Janice Willis, all of whom point to collective and popular bases for donations, especially by women."

The same observation holds true for non-Jaina historical sources, especially for inscriptions, as summarised by Sircar 1965: 126f.:

"The Preamble generally comprises the following items: (1) invocation, (2) the place of issue, (3) the name of the donor with his titles and ancestry, and (4) the address in respect of the grant. The Notification similarly comprises: (1) specification of the gift, (2) the name of the donor, (3) the occasion of the grant, (4) the purpose of the grant, and (5) the boundaries of the gift land. The Conclusion likewise contains: (1) an exhortation in respect of the grant, (2) the names of the officials responsible for the preparation of the document, and (3) the date and authentication of the record."

Salomon 1998: 115-26 repeats Sircar's characterisation. Given the formulaic nature of inscriptions, the lack of prosopographical studies of the material is surprising.

Donative inscriptions,²² chronicles, and colophons, above all, contain numerous nuggets of carefully pre-formatted, more or less reliable, historical information, which is otherwise rare in the Jaina sources. These isolates can be collected, coded, entered into a database, and then interlinked for the reconstruction of monastic lineages, religious networks, and patronage patterns.²³ Obviously, the schematically presented information provided by these primary sources reflects, here, as elsewhere, only selected data on particular activities of members of the social elites, and is not necessarily accurate. The process of aggregating information involves continuous re-analysis of the evidence.

2. Jaina-Prosopography: Old-Style and New-Style

The advantages of arrays of aggregated data as tools for the discovery of new relationships in complex sets of facts²⁴ are recognised for some time in South Asian Studies. Meta-catalogues such as T. Aufrecht's (1891, 1896, 1903) *Catalogus Catalogorum*, the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* produced by the University of Madras (1949-2014), and the first volume of H. D. Velankar's (1944) unfinished *Jinaratnakośa* have become indispensable research tools for any student of the history of South Asian literature and culture. The only extensive work to date to offer aggregate biographical, literary-historical and geographical information both for the literary historian, the historian of religion and the social historian of South Asia is J. Klatt's (2016) belatedly published *Jaina-Onomasticon*.²⁵ The transformation of Klatt's predominantly bio-bibliographical data into a prosopographical database, supplemented by further information provided by inscriptions, colophons, and biographical literature, has the potential of producing a dataset that is sufficiently large to offer possibilities of discovering new patterns, not only of "patronage" relationships, through prosopographical analysis, visualisation tools, statistical investigation, and traditional forms of scholarship.

First stage prosopographical investigations of socio-historical data started in earnest in 1874, when T. Mommsen initiated his second large-scale project on secular Roman elites, the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (PIR 1897-2015) (from 1901 supported by A. Harnack), which only recently was brought to a conclusion by J. Heil under the aegis of W. Eck (1993, 1994).²⁶ PIR was only possible because it could build on the compilations of epigraphic data in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (1863 ff.).²⁷ It was supplemented most significantly by the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (PLRE) of Jones, Martindale and Morris (1971, 1980, 1992), and, on religious elites, by Henri Irénée Marrou's and Jean-Rémy Palanque's *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire* (PCBE) (Publications from 1982), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* (PmBZ) by Winkelmann and Lilie et al. (1998-2001),²⁸ *Fasti sacerdotum* by Rüpke et al. (2005), and the *Prosopography of the Byzantine World* (PBW) by Jeffreys et al. (2017). The enormous amount of data on social and religious

For formulaic contents of colophons the remark of Balbir et al. 2006: 142 must suffice: "The sponsors of such manuscripts were particularly keen to give information about the identity and place of the partners, from the instigator to the donor, which led to such impressive results." The following repeatedly used categories are highlighted: (i) Lay patron's family and activities, (ii) Monk's insertion within succession of pontiffs of religious group, (iii) circumstances of interaction (ibid.).

²² Salomon 1998: 243 stresses the significance of Jaina epigraphic materials, though mainly as supplements to canonical evidence:

"The very abundant and relatively well-documented inscriptions of the Jainas (8.1.3.4), especially in western India of the medieval period, offer a rich fund of information for the study of Jaina religion, ethics, and especially monastic organization. [...] Inscriptions provide abundant details on the history of Jaina sectarian and monastic history and organization, in the form of the names, lineages, and positions of many Jaina clerics (cf. IC I.170). This data may be profitably used as a corroborative and supplementary source to information provided in the canonical literature."

He highlights the historical significance of "an inscription from Pattana (EI 1, 1892, 319-24) which provides a list of the twenty-four heads of the Kharatara-gaccha and describes the patronage of that community by the Mughal emperor Akbar, and an old manuscript copy of a lost inscription from Śatruñjaya recording the resolutions of a council of Śvetāmbara monks in A.D. 1242" (p. 243).

²³ "The use and development of prosopography [...] is closely connected with the problem of scarcity of historical data" (Verbon, Carlier & Dumolyn 2007: 36).

²⁴ Fictions are facts of kinds as well.

²⁵ See Flügel 2017a.

²⁶ Rebenich 1997: 117 details the problems that lead to the interruption of the project between 1933 and the 1990s, and points to the fact that the most important results had already been published in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* edited by Wissowa et al. 1894-1980.

²⁷ "Eine Arbeit dieser Art ist nur ausführbar, nachdem das inschriftliche Material zum Gebrauche geordnet vorliegt" (Mommsen 1874: 22).

²⁸ See Rebenich 1997: 111 n. 6-8, PmBZ: <http://www.pmbz.de/arbeitsgruppe.ger.php>.

elites, of the Roman Empire in particular, which are now being transformed into prosopographical databases, awaits systematic quantitative analysis. These and other pioneering mega-projects, which inspired further collective biographies and prosopographical investigations, were initially restricted to the history of Europe and of the Near East,²⁹ but are can now be found all over the world, particularly impressively as regards to Chinese materials.³⁰

Research on elite socio-religious lineages, networks and patterns of patronage in South Asia, by contrast, has focused almost exclusively on historical case studies. The vast corpus of published data in epigraphic and manuscript catalogues has not yet been entered into databases to an extent that would permit second-stage prosopographical analysis as a third phase in the sequence of research, following the initial publication and aggregation of raw data.

Two new and still growing prosopographical datasets of South Asian materials are exceptional. The prosopographical database PANDIT, for Sanskrit texts and authors, developed and edited by Y. Bronner et al. (2015 ff.),³¹ now incorporates other datasets as well, such as the database produced for the innovative *Knowledge Systems Project* of S. Pollock (2000), and K. Potter's *Bibliography of Indian Philosophies. PERSO-INDICA*, edited by F. Speziale and C. W. Ernst (2000 ff.), is doing much of the same for Persian literature on India, and also draws on other digitally available meta-data.³² Both databases collect bio-bibliographical information on authors of primary literature in manuscript and printed form, as well as secondary literature, but offer little information on Jaina authors and texts. Because of the type of collected information, predominantly meta-data, and of their coding frames, the databases do not lend themselves to quantitative analysis as yet, which would require greater depth and segmentation of the data, as well as a different approach.³³ Notable is also the new SIDDHAM database for the study of inscriptions from South and Central Asia of the ongoing project *Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State* by M. Willis et al. (2017), which offers valuable materials for prosopographical analysis.

Crucial for the *Jaina-Prosopography* project is a sufficiently differentiated coding system, that permits computing sociological variables on the social background of mendicants, supporters, opponents, itineraries, patronage patterns, and so forth, besides standard bibliographical information. The principal analytical work is done in the course of the creation of the database itself. Firstly, the analysis of cross-sections of the entire available evidence is required, in view of development of the coding categories, and, secondly, the careful categorisation of select information at the point of data-entry or data-mining. The task is to encode traces of historical information left behind by a defined group of individuals without significant loss of information. All participants in the Jaina discourse and transactional network, constituting the Jaina social system,³⁴ are defined as members of the "group" to be studied.³⁵ Prosopographical analysis will cast new light on the monastic-, social- and literary history of the Jaina tradition. The resulting database will provide much information on historical personalities and their work, locations, etc., which is not easily available elsewhere, not only on Jaina mendicants, but also on Jaina laity, and other individuals. It will be made freely available online, in the hope

²⁹ See Keats-Rohan 2007, Cabouret & Demotz 2014.

³⁰ See footnote 8.

³¹ In 2017: 35,158 Prints, 9,403 Works, 3,863 Persons, 2,129 Manuscripts, 101 Sites, 15 Institutions. See <http://www.panditproject.org>.

³² "Perso-Indica stands within the tradition of bibliographical surveys of Persian sources, yet it is very different from traditional catalogues. By the use of flexible computing tools the database allows to acquire textual and prosopographical metadata. Moreover, it has been launched as an online resource with free access to its entries" (Speziale & Ernst 2015: 1).

³³ The social-historical projects of Minkowski, O'Hanlon and Venkatkrishnan 2015 deserve to be mentioned in this context, though databases do not seem to play a significant role.

³⁴ On the Jaina tradition as a "social system" see Flügel 2018b. The definition of "Jaina discourse" as the chosen unit for investigation implies reflexivity, since the researcher and other (participant) observers participate in the discourse and social system, in one way or another.

³⁵ Cf. discussions on the relationship between a "field of study," "group for itself," "group in-itself," and "quasi-group."

that researchers will find it useful for their own projects, and incrementally add further data as to the databases of PERSO-INDICA and PANDIT,³⁶ whichever form of data analysis is preferred.

The more compatible with other datasets a prosopographical database it, the greater is its usefulness. Semantic integration with other databases is technologically enabled by the utilised triplestore (RDF) database system.³⁷ Furthermore, as much as possible, agreement with the categories used by electronic catalogues of major libraries, such as the Library of Congress and the British Library, XML based TEI databases, relevant electronic library catalogues, has been built into the design of the Jaina-Prosopography. On the other hand, the coding system of the Jaina-Prosopography³⁸ is designed to preserve as much variation in the primary sources as necessary, by taking recourse to emic terms. The categories used by Jaina libraries, particularly by the pioneering electronic catalogue of the Acharya Shri Kailasasagarsuri Gyanmandir in Koba, have been studied in great detail and taken into account in this regard.³⁹

To date, no conscious attempt has been made to create a comprehensive data model such as this for the systematic analysis of Jaina historical data.⁴⁰ Rudimentary categories of classification have been developed already by the pioneering cataloguers of the 19th and 20th centuries. But very few epigraphic and manuscript catalogues address problems of coding explicitly, and even fewer take into account social variables. The remainder of this article examines some of the strengths and weaknesses of the implicit prosopographical models of Indological catalogues, and explores the difficulties involved in the re-coding of data on “patronage” relationships in South Asia in terms of prosopographical variables.

3. Concepts of “Patronage” in English and Sanskrit

It is not easy to operationalise the widely used English terms “patron” and “patronage” for sociological investigations of South Asian history and culture. “Patron” and “patronage” are observer categories. They carry a wide range of meanings in English (and other European languages), while correlative terms in Sanskrit and other South Asian languages add further shades of meaning. The first step is to clarify the basic terminology in English and Sanskrit. For the limited purposes of this article a focus on two languages will have to suffice. A cursory glance at earlier studies of “patronage” in South Asia (and elsewhere) shows that this is by no means a trivial exercise, since few, if any, of the many previous studies of “patronage” or “patron-client relationships” in South Asia attempt to disambiguate the layers of meaning of both etic and emic terms. Generally, they rely on common understandings.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (2017) distinguishes two principal types of meaning for the term “patron,” derived from Latin *patronus*, “protector of clients, defender,” from *pater*, *patr*, “father,” that in English became current in the 14th century: “**I**. A person standing in a role of oversight, protection, or sponsorship to another,” and “**II**. A master, commander, or owner.” Altogether, the nine (6+3) subtypes and twelve (8+4) ancillary types listed in the OED represent eighteen more or less distinct shades of meaning:

I (1) “*Christian Church*. A person who holds the right of presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice; the holder of the advowson,” **(2)** “**a**. In ancient Rome: a defender or advocate before a court of justice; (*Ancient Greek Hist.*) a citizen under whose protection a resident alien placed himself for protection, and who transacted legal business for him and was responsible to the state for his conduct,” “**b**. Chiefly *Roman Hist.* A man of status or distinction who gives protection and aid to another person in return for deference and certain services (cf. CLIENT n. 1c). Also: a man in relation to a manumitted slave over

³⁶ The database is hosted by the Digital Humanities institute (DHI) at the University of Sheffield. New information will be processed by the editors of the database, presently Peter Flügel and Kornelius Krümpelmann of the CoJS at SOAS.

³⁷ Cf. Broux 2015, Bodard 2017.

³⁸ Developed by Peter Flügel & Kornelius Krümpelmann.

³⁹ Padmasāgarasūri 2003-13. The combined electronic manuscript-, book- and journal catalogue is the brain-child of Ācārya Ajayasāgara.

⁴⁰ An exception are two specific datasets which Himel Trikha has created for private use, and made available under the title DIPAL: *Digambara Philosophers in the Age of Logic*: dipal.org

whom he retains a certain degree of jurisdiction,” (3) “**a.** A saint to whose intercession and protection a person, place, occupation, etc., is specially entrusted. Now more fully PATRON SAINT *n.*,” “**b.** *Classical Mythol.* A tutelary god,” “**c.** *Irish English.* = PATRON DAY *n.*,” (4) “**a.** A lord, master, or protector of a person or place; a ruler or chief; (*Feudal Law*) a lord superior,” “**b.** An adviser, a mentor. *Obs.*,” “**c.** A founder of a religious order. *Obs.*,” (5) “**a.** A person or organization that uses money or influence to advance the interests of a person, cause, art, etc.; *spec.* (in the 17th and 18th centuries) a well-known person who accepts the dedication of a book (*obs.*). In later use also: a distinguished person who holds an honorary position in a charity, foundation, etc. Also *fig.*,” “**b.** A supporter, upholder, or advocate of a theory or doctrine. *Obs.*,” “**c.** A person who supports or frequents a business or other institution; a customer of a shop, restaurant, theatre, etc.,” (6) “*N. Amer.* With capital initial. A member of either of two political associations (the Patrons of Husbandry and the Patrons of Industry), founded respectively in the United States in 1867 and Canada in 1891, for the promotion of farming interests. Usually in *pl.* Now *hist.*”

II (7) “**a.** In early use: †the captain or master of a ship, esp. a galley or carrack (*obs.*). In later use (now chiefly *N. Amer.*): the master or steersman of a barge, longboat, etc.,” “**b.** In extended use: any captain of a ship in the ancient world. *Obs.*,” (8) “A master or owner of a slave in the eastern Mediterranean or North Africa. *Obs.*,” (9) “**a.** Also *patrón*. The owner of a hacienda; (in New Mexico) the master or head of a family,” “**b.** Originally: the host or landlord of an inn, esp. in Spain. Later more widely: the proprietor of any inn or restaurant.”

The documented types of usage of the term “patronage” are less numerous:

(1) “*Christian Church.* The right of presenting a member of the clergy to a particular ecclesiastical benefice or living; [...],” (2) “**a.** The action of a patron in using money or influence to advance the interests of a person, cause, art, etc.,” “†**b.** *spec.* Protection, defence. *Obs.*,” “**c.** Justification, support; advocacy. *Obs.*,” “**d.** *Roman Hist.* The rights and duties, or the position, of a patron [...]; the protection provided by a patron,” “**e.** Custom given to a business, shop, restaurant, theatre, etc.; the giving of such custom. Formerly also: †*clientele (obs.)*,” “**f.** Favour shown with an air or assumption of superiority; patronizing manner,” (3) “Guardianship, tutelary care, esp. on the part of a patron saint, god, etc.,” (4) “*Heraldry. Arms of Patronage n.* arms derived from those of a patron or superior. Now *hist.*,” (5) “The power or right to control appointments to public office or the right to privileges.”

While the English nouns “patron” and “patronage” are highly ambiguous, the meaning of the verb “to patronize,” from the Latin *patronare*, seems more straightforward: “to act as a patron towards, to extend patronage to (a person, cause, etc.); to protect, support, favour, or encourage.” However, to render prosopographical analysis possible, the different aspects of protection (political, spiritual, etc.), support (economic, moral, etc.), favour (appointment, privileges, etc.), and encouragement (command, inspiration, appreciation, etc.), and possibly others, need to be clearly distinguished, at least in principle, even if primary sources rarely specify the contextual meaning(s) of emic terms that could be rendered as “patronage.”

The principal interpretative possibilities for representing references to “patronage-” in a comprehensive prosopographical coding scheme seem to correspond to OED-types 2a, 2b, 3 & 5: (i) physical protection, (ii) material support, (iii) tutelage (by a saint, god, etc.), (iv) power of appointment or conveyance of privileges. Additionally, (v) political or legal support, mentioned in the OED under “patron,” seems to be as relevant in India as in Europe. Although the term “patronage” designates a relationship between supporter and beneficiary which implies some form of reciprocity, it has been conceived throughout the OED from the perspective of the

giver rather than the receiver. All types of patronage are presented as asymmetrical transactions, or “free gifts.”⁴¹ Neither the receivers nor the purposes of gift-giving are indicated.

The overall classification seems to reflect the distinction between different spheres of social life in modern Europe: (a) politics (~protection), (b) economics (~material support), (c) religion (~spiritual support, tutelage, etc.),⁴² with (d-e) arguably as sub-categories of either politics or religion. Yet, in the current literature it became common to speak of “political patronage” in the sense of (d): conveyance of *office* in return for political support. For M. Weber (1922/1985: 691, 813), by contrast, “political patronage” means conveyance of *protection* in return for political support. At first sight, the type of receiver or general purpose of an act of “patronage” seems to be clearly indicated by combinations of the noun “patronage” with a specifying adjective. Yet, the example of the ambiguous term “religious patronage” suggests otherwise. The expression is usually taken to refer to the “support of religion / a religious cause” via material gifts. Implicitly, the provision of material support is often understood in the sense of the legitimation theory of M. Weber, as an act of politically motivated prestation *in the expectation of a return*, that is, public consent to rule, which in turn attracts political support.⁴³ Hence, in common usage, “religious patronage” is virtually identical with “political patronage,” albeit referring only to a specific subset of potential recipients. Alternatively, “religious patronage” could mean “religiously motivated patronage,” “patronage by a religious specialist” or “patronage by a religious institution.” It becomes instantly clear from this preliminary survey that the analytical utility of the catch-all term “patronage” can only be established after its principal facets have been typologically analysed and given clearer sociological meaning. The required typological analysis is unlikely to succeed if relations of “patronage” are isolated from the social structural context, i.e. without considering typical social positions of the parties involved.

The usefulness of European linguistic or sociological categories for the understanding of historical processes in South Asia can only be established by cross-checking corresponding emic terminology, where distinctions between politics and religion are not always as clear cut. Firstly, the translations offered by Sanskrit and other dictionaries have to be scrutinised, and, secondly, the specific terminology used by the Jains in text and practice. Monier-Williams (1851: 577) defines the designation “patron” broadly as “One who supports and protects.” According to him, each of the two words “patron” and “patronage” can serve as an English translation of at least twenty-seven semantically often quite distinct Sanskrit terms.⁴⁴ His privileged term is *pālaka*, the “guardian, protector,” “prince, ruler, sovereign,” “maintainer,” etc. (Monier-Williams 1899: 623). Borooah (1877: 509) offers only six and three Sanskrit equivalent terms respectively, adding “etc.” at the end of the entry for “patron.”⁴⁵ As a lawyer, he privileged more concise definitions, and hence distinguishes, somewhat artificially, between (I) patron/patroness “in law” (*svāmin*), and the (II) “protector, supporter” in general, subdivided the latter into (1) one who offers refuge and/or assistance (*āśraya*), (2) one who offers respect (*sambhāvayitr*), and (3) one who offers protection (*anupālayitr*). Apte (1884: 334) has 11 terms each for

⁴¹ Cf. Thapar 1992/2005: 589 and *infra*.

⁴² “Because patronage pertains to protection and to material benefit, it must be embedded in the structures of political and economic relations of any society. As a result, patronage may be expected to tell us about the societies in which it is manifested, and, if this is true, then it must also be the case that extant forms of patronage in any society, and changes in these forms, result from ambient social, political, and economic relationships as much as from the meanings that attach to patronage acts and processes. Religious institutions of the Vijayanagara era (broadly, from about 1350 to 1700) command attention in any consideration of those acts and processes which conferred protection and benefit for several obvious reasons” (Stein 1992: 160).

⁴³ E.g. Talbot 1991: 336, Granoff & Shinohara 2003: 3, 12, Laughlin 2003a: 15, 2003b: 302, Schmiedchen 2014: 9f.

⁴⁴ “PATRON, *s.* (One who supports and protects) pālakaḥ, pratipālakaḥ, anupālakaḥ, upakāraḥ, upakārī *m.* (n), samvardhakaḥ, anugrahī *m.*, pakṣadhārī *m.*, poṣakaḥ, rakṣakaḥ, āśrayaḥ, āśrayabhūtaḥ, śaraṇaṁ, śaraṇabhūtaḥ, āśrayasthānaṁ, nāthaḥ, puraskārī *m.*, puraskartā *m.* (trtr), upakartā *m.*, sāhāyākārī *m.*, sahāyaḥ, piṇḍadaḥ. - (Appreciator of merit) guṇagrāhī *m.* (n), guṇagrāhakaḥ, guṇajñāḥ, guṇadarśī *m.*; ‘patron of learning,’ vidyānupālakaḥ” (Monier-Williams 1851: 577).

“PATRONAGE, *s.* pālanaṁ, anupālanaṁ, pratipālanaṁ, upakāraḥ, āśrayaḥ, samśrayaḥ, anugrahaḥ, upagrahaḥ, saṅgrahaḥ, āgrahaḥ, ādhāraḥ, avaśṭambhaḥ, vardhanaṁ, samvardhanaṁ, avalambaḥ -mbaraṁ, śaraṇyatā, puraskāraḥ, rakṣā -kṣaṇa, abhiraḥ, poṣaṇaṁ, pālanaḥ, pālanaḥ, sahāyāṁ, sahāyatvaṁ, sāhityaṁ, pratipālakatā. - (Appreciation of merit) guṇagrahana, guṇajñānaṁ” (ibid.).

⁴⁵ “PATRON, PATRONESS: I. In law: svāmin (f. nī). II. Protector, supporter: (1) āśrayaḥ (= refuge), *p. of wits*: āśrayo rasikānām, K.; (2) sambhāvayitr (f. trī), *p. of the learned*: sambhāvayitā buddhān, D. viii; (3) anupālayitr (f. trī); etc.” (Borooah 1877: 509). “PATRONAGE: (1) sāhāyāṁ (= aid); (2) ānu-kūlyam (= favour); (3) sambhāvanā (?)” (ibid.).

“patron” and for “patronage,”⁴⁶ altogether a blend of the terms listed in the two older dictionaries. One can only speculate, why Monier-Williams (1851), who apparently coined some Sanskrit neologisms himself to meet the missionary purposes of his dictionary, does not include in his list the role of the *svāmin*, the “owner,” “commander,” “husband,” “king,” “spiritual preceptor,” or “learned Brahman or Pandit” (Monier-Williams 1899: 1284), nor the role of the *sambhāvayitr*, “the one who honours or respects or reveres” someone of status (*sambhāva*) (ibid., p. 1179), a term privileged by Borooh and Apte. Likely, the first term was excluded, because it is highly ambiguous, and the second one, because it does not have explicit connotations with either protection or material support, which could, however, be implied. The brief glance at some of the English-Sanskrit dictionaries shows that the complex linguistic and historical evidence of the sources is clearly not exhaustively represented. The same can be said about the Sanskrit-English dictionaries, and others.

4. Studies of “Patronage” in South Asia

The academic literature on “patronage” relationships in South Asia invariably concentrates on the rather narrow aspect of material sponsorship predominantly of religious projects: the construction and maintenance of temples or other material infrastructure, maintenance of religious virtuosi, copying of manuscripts, organisation of community pilgrimages, and so on. In contrast to such “economic” forms of patronage, “political” and “religious” forms of patronage, whether through the conveyance of political or religious protection, or the conveyance of office, are almost entirely ignored.⁴⁷ Acts of material sponsorship of literature, temples, art,⁴⁸ or arrangements for circulating ascetics, are interpreted as vehicles for projecting the influence of sponsors over wide geographical areas.⁴⁹ Conversely, the sponsorship of householders by itinerant renunciators, through visits, blessings, and instruction, is generally not registered under the label “patronage,” despite the fact that religious virtuosi spread their influence through the conveyance of spiritual goods as much as householders expand their influence through material gifts. In both cases, gaining influence is generally not presented as an end in itself, but as a means for the accomplishment of a greater good.

Usually, “court patronage” of temple economies, Sanskrit literature, etc., is foregrounded in the literature.⁵⁰ R. Thapar was the first historian to highlight the existence of different types and roles of (economic) “patrons” and “patronage” of religious projects in ancient India, and, at the hand of Lüders’s (1912) *List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to About A.D. 400*, distinguished three (additional) types of patrons: “The patrons see each other in different ways: as individual donors, as families making donations, or as a community of donors” (Thapar 1992/2005: 599).⁵¹ She argues that patronage in the name of a religious community was “a cultural and social innovation” of the period 200 BCE - 400 CE, culminating in the Gupta period. It was mainly promoted by leading members of the Buddhist and Jaina communities, present at royal courts and urban centres, who financed, for instance, the construction of *stūpas*. Dynasties were only marginally involved: “The patrons were the communities of traders, artisans, guilds of craftsmen, small-scale landowners - the *setthigahapati* families - and monks and nuns” (Thapar 1987/1994: 28).⁵² She notes that “it is curious that these social groups

⁴⁶ “Patron, *s.* sambhāvayitr *m.*, pālakaḥ, upakāraḥ, saṁvardhakaḥ, āśrayaḥ, puraskartr *m.*, rakṣakaḥ, śaraṇaṁ; nāthaḥ, poṣakaḥ, piṇḍadaḥ. -age, *s.* sambhāvanā, āśrayaḥ, sāhāyāṁ, anugrahaḥ, upakāraḥ, pālanaṁ, poṣaṇaṁ, rakṣaṇaṁ, saṁvardhanaṁ, avalambāḥ, puraskāraḥ. -al, *a.* rakṣaka, vardhaka. -ize, *v. t.* saṁ-bhū c., āśrayaṁ dā 3 U, prati-anu-pā c. (pālayati), anugrah 9 P, avalamb 1, saṁvrdh c.; oft. by (*s.*) with bhū 1 P. -less, *a.* nirāśraya, anātha, aśaraṇa, niravalaṁba, nirādhāra” (Apte 1884: 334).

⁴⁷ “All acts of patronage require the disposition of resources, of which money is the most serviceable [...]. The power to grant access to power or office is almost as beneficial as money. A patron with power and resources can dominate those who are made to be or become beholden to him or her. The allegiance of the patronised is an expectation which carries obligations to the patron. There are others who desperately want to be favoured by the patron, who are outside the field of power” (McCulloch 2014: 202).

⁴⁸ Two of the latest case-studies of this kind regarding Jaina religious sites are Laughlin 2003a, 2003b and Owen 2010.

⁴⁹ E.g. Thapar 1987, Stoler Miller & Eaton 1992, Pouchepadass 2002, Clémentin-Ojha 2009.

⁵⁰ Recently, see for instance Collins 1989: 117, 123, Ali 2004: 14, Pollock 2006: 231-3, Bakker 2010: 6, 17, Schmiedchen 2014.

⁵¹ Community donations are collections of individual donations brought together by a common religious cause: “Donation involved an exchange of a gift (*dāna*) in return for merit (*puṇya*). The gift was a gift of a collectivity but at the same time its record was personalized” (Thapar 1987: 29).

⁵² Talbot 1991: 327 found patterns similar to court patronage in the prestations of non-landed elites such as merchants in 13th c. Andrah Pradeś: “patronage of major temples meant that non-landed persons could have gained acceptance (and commercial contacts) in a community of worship that encompassed varied segments of society and a considerable territorial expanse.”

“made no apparent attempt to contribute towards the construction of secular buildings or perhaps such attempts have not survived” (Thapar 1992/2005: 606). An answer to the implied question is provided by the following second important point made by Thapar:

“The concept of patronage is usually restricted to the relationship between the patron and the recipient of patronage [...]. Further, the recipient is often regarded as subservient to the patron since the former is dependent for his livelihood on the latter. This focus obstructs the consideration of what the patron receives in return for extending patronage” (p. 589)⁵³

Studies of “patron-client relationships,” modelled on ancient Roman precedent, almost always assume that the patron, or giver of protection or support, is ranked higher than the receiver.⁵⁴ In the Vedic *varṇa*- or class system, however, the principal receivers of gifts, the Brahmins, are ranked higher than the principal givers, the Kṣatriyas. This raises problems for some political theories of patronage, and for the label “patron-client relationship,” though not for M. Weber’s theory of legitimation. With reference to evidence from the Vijayanagara Empire, B. Stein (1992) concludes from the fact that many acts of patronage in medieval India (here: individual gift-giving) imply an acknowledgment of the superior status of the recipient over the giver, that this type of “patronage” needs to be clearly distinguished from “political patronage” offered with the aim of creating vassals. Somewhat counter-intuitively, Stein chooses as examples of patronage acts of honouring individuals located lower in the social hierarchy, for their contributions to the maintenance of the social whole, as Brahmins would receive gifts as representatives of the totality of the hierarchical order of society. The passage is worth quoting in full:

“[P]atronage benefits were signs of their differentiated status among others in their villages and localities. Patronage acts marked the superior, differentiated standing of the recipient in the society of the Vijayanagara age; men were thereby honoured for their contribution that they and their kinsmen made to the localized societies of the time. But even beyond this, the entitlements granted by those with authority to do so were constitutive in another way. Patronage enactments marked each of these societies as a morally complete unity, a whole made up of recognized and necessary constituent parts. Headmen, or *petels* as they were called by the British, received investiture from chiefs and kings and in their turn, *petels* conferred similar patronage benefits upon village servants and militiamen thus participating themselves in a sort of royal patronage. [...]

Somewhere between the totally personal and unconditional gift and the totally impersonal commodity transaction was the patronage act and its processes that imparted enduring forms of relationships and significations. If patronage is seen merely as the provision of resources for the production of works of high artistic merit, as it might be conceived to be,⁵⁵ then the concept of patronage becomes as narrow as it has long been in European societies. Similarly, if patronage is taken generally to pertain to *ad hoc* benefits and protection conferred by a powerful patron upon a powerless client, it would seem little different from charity, or *noblesse oblige*, and too vague to be useful for grasping an earlier Indian world.

⁵³ In the context of a presentation of a stage-model, from individual patronage to community patronage, Thapar 1987/1994: 26 argued that originally royal patronage, at first in exchange to bardic eulogies and genealogical constructions, served the social control of traditions: “The definition of patronage is popularly treated as a restricted one: the wealth given by a person of superior status to an artist to enable the latter to produce a work of art. But the act of patronage is neither so restricted nor so simple. It implies a variety of social categories which participate in the making of the cultural object; implicit also is the understanding of the institution which is created from the act of patronage and has social manifestations. It becomes the legitimizer of the patron and, in addition, to a possible role of authority, may take on other social roles. Not least of all is the consideration of the audience to which the act of patronage is directed, which may operate as the arbiter of the patronage in question. Patronage therefore can act as a cultural catalyst.”

⁵⁴ See for instance Eisenstadt & Lemarchand 1981.

⁵⁵ Stein refers to Thapar here.

Instead, we may take patronage in its Indian meaning derived from the *yajamāna* relationship,⁵⁶ patronage being what a *yajamāna* does to constitute relationships upon which the well-being of the social order is seen to depend and to constitute meanings that set the morality of that order” (165f.).

Implicitly following M. Weber’s (1922/1985: 691) model of the complementary relationship between church and state (status & power) in the history of Europe,⁵⁷ Dumont (1962/1980: 297) argues that, in ancient India, kingship (*rājya*) had become increasingly secularised in a process of hierarchical differentiation of the spheres of political power (*kṣatra*) and religious authority (*brahman*).⁵⁸ Dumont, like Weber, highlights the structural alliance between the two ruling classes, whose members engaged in asymmetrical complementary exchanges of material and symbolic goods, which enabled them to convert power into status and vice versa, and thus to maintain their combined dominance at the apex of a hierarchical status society, which was conceived by the Brahmins as an organic whole.⁵⁹

In this classical model of Indian⁶⁰ “kingship,” set in contrast to models of “sacred kingship,” political power was secular and could therefore stabilise itself only indirectly through acts of gift giving that expressed the voluntary subordination to the self-declared representatives of the interests of society as a whole. Patronage patterns evidently changed in late- and post-Vedic society, when in the context of the development of new modes of production early state systems developed, first under the influence of Jainism and Buddhism, and then again in the context of the Gupta Empire, and other kingdoms that were dominated by a reformed Brahmanism. H. Bakker (2010: 4f.) points to the new role of “court patronage” in the late Gupta period, that is, patronage not only of the king, but of courtiers from a plurality of religious backgrounds, which begs the question about the causes of such large-scale changes in patronage patterns:

“This is not to say, of course, that the Guptas invented religious patronage, but their rule marked the emergence of kings and courtiers as a major class of patrons, whereas earlier ‘groups of lay people’ were the prominent sponsors. And in contrast to most of the earlier patrons, their patronage extended to religions other than their personal persuasions, thus spreading an atmosphere of religious tolerance throughout the realm.”

Having reached similar conclusions, in an earlier article S. Pollock (1996: 203)⁶¹ re-opened the question as to why political rulers would sponsor religious and cultural projects to the extent they did. Pollock’s answer points to a direct political function of ritual and symbolic practices, arguing that here was an important aspect of South Asian political practice that had previously been overlooked. In contrast to M. Weber’s legitimation theory, which he, and later D. Ali (2004: 13-17), criticise as “instrumentalist,”⁶² Pollock (1996: 198) proposes two

⁵⁶ Because the relationship of the *yajamāna*, who paid for a sacrifice, to the sacrificing priest was part of the standard Vedic ritual routine, Thapar 1992/2005 describes it as a form of “embedded patronage.” The term *yajamāna* in its general sense as “patron, host, rich man, head of a family or tribe” (Monier-Williams 1899: 839) is never used in a Jaina religious context.

⁵⁷ “As a rule, priestly charisma compromised with the secular power, most of the time tacitly but sometimes also through a concordat. Thus the spheres of control were mutually guaranteed, and each power was permitted to exert certain influences in the other’s realm in order to minimize collisions of interest [...]. The secular ruler makes available to the priests the external means of enforcement for the maintenance of their power or at least for the collection of church taxes and other contributions. In return, the priests offer their religious sanctions in support of the ruler’s legitimacy and for the domestication of the subjects” (M. Weber 1922/1985: 690f./ 1968/1978: 1161f.).

⁵⁸ “[P]ower in India became secular at a very early date” (Dumont 1966/1980: 76).

⁵⁹ “Power is subordinate to status in its direct relationship to it, and is surreptitiously assimilated to status in a secondary capacity in opposition to everything else” - whereas “our own society subordinates status to power: it is egalitarian as far as ideology goes” (Dumont 1966/1980: 212f.).

⁶⁰ In M. Weber’s text, the model was clearly derived from European precedent.

⁶¹ See also Pollock 2006: 231, and on the secondary Jaina influence also p. 29.

⁶² Ali’s 2004: 13ff. and Pollock’s 2006 portrayals of Weber’s models of “legitimacy” and “legitimation” do not take into account Weber’s 1922/1985: 16 etc. multi-factorial approach. Weber (pp. 680, 691) acknowledges the role of culture and highlights the “Minimum von theokratischen oder cäsaropapistischen Elementen” in any form of legitimate political power (*Gewalt*). However, he takes a methodological individualist stance, and hence sees value spheres merely as factors that channel action into certain directions, whereas the holistic point of view, reluctantly embraced by the two critics, privileges the influence cultural paradigms. This perspective, an inversion of the individual-centred perspective, has been theoretically most concisely articulated by Othmar Spann 1918/1923, whose ideal of a state of hierarchized social statuses, described as reflexive “part-wholes,” echoed by Dumont, reads like a blueprint for Geertz’s 1980: 19 depiction of the Balinese “theatre state,” which evidently influenced Pollock’s notion of “aesthetic power,” where in contrast to the dominant Indian

alternative concepts: firstly the term “aesthetic power,”⁶³ also labelled “culture power,” and secondly the model of “mutually constitutive” political- and aesthetic powers.⁶⁴ Though Pollock ultimately shies away from equating political and aesthetic power, which Ali regrets, the overall thrust of the two kindred approaches echoes Bourdieu’s (1979) theory of “symbolic power/capital,” as well as Geertz’s (1980: 24) notion of the political “power of prestige,” measured in terms of culturally specific paradigms of the “exemplary center” which were shaped by “controlling political ideas” (p. 13).⁶⁵

For Bourdieu (1979/1998: 315f.), writing about modern France, “temporal and spiritual powers [...] are simultaneously instruments of power and stakes in the struggle for power,” situated in a “field of power,” constituted by “different forms of capital” (economic, educational, etc.).⁶⁶ His somewhat vague use of the amorphous terms “power” and “capital” as synonymous catch-all designations for “capacities,” that can be controlled, does not always help elucidating specific power relations. However, Bourdieu’s reflections on the practice of patronage go beyond the idea of mutually constitutive exchanges between the “proprietors” of political power and of aesthetic power,⁶⁷ culminating in the insight that individual acts of patronage are often elements of larger cycles of redistribution, which at the same time function as systems of accumulation and as systems of legitimation:

“[T]he state, by redistributing material resources, produces a symbolic effect. This is something extremely simple, which can be seen very well in precapitalist societies, where primitive forms of accumulation are based precisely on redistribution. We know today that things that appear as waste – the act of giving away blankets or yams – are in fact a kind of accumulation. The symbolic alchemy consists precisely in redistribution: I receive money and, by giving it back, I transfigure it into a donation of recognition – the word ‘recognition’ can be taken in both senses, meaning both gratitude and the recognition of legitimacy” (Bourdieu 2012/2014: 273).⁶⁸

model the status of kingship as the dominant cultural ideal is ranked higher than the status of priesthood: “The first, the cultural element came [...] from the top down and the center outward. The second, the power element, grew [...] from the bottom up and the periphery inward.”

⁶³ Ali 2006: 16f. rightly asks: “If Sanskrit *kāvya*, as Pollock maintains, constituted a sort of ‘aesthetic power’ then the question must be asked as to what the nature of power really was.” In his view Pollock committed two fallacies: (1) He retains the idea that *kāvya* merely aestheticises politics, predicated on modern concepts of politics and aesthetics, and is therefore “vulnerable to some of the same criticisms which he so ably levels against legitimization theory,” and (2) focuses merely on the form of literary Sanskrit, but does not seriously engage with its contents. His own answer, “that one of the first operations of aesthetics as power was the reproduction of the court as an ‘interpretive community’,” which, through literature, was educated into a reflexive and “theatrical way of life,” does not quite answer the question as to the nature of the “political” in medieval Indian society. Clear is only that he does not believe that “political power is constituted outside the realm of ideation” and that “ideas constitute [...] political actions” (p. 14). M. Weber and N. Elias considered other factors, such as legal and economic structures, as well.

⁶⁴ Pollock 2006: 14, 18f., invokes all three of the cited alternatives (p. 523), echoing Geertz 1980: 62 representation of “the Balinese” notion of power [I] as “a structure of thought” (p.135), an aesthetic or cultural paradigm, through which power [II] (=loyalty) was “cumulated from the bottom” of society, in a continuum of hierarchical levels connecting ideal and the real, where even “the real is as imagined as the imaginary” (p. 136). The term “power” is here used in a variety of different, highly ambiguous ways. See also Ali’s 2004: 14 critique of the “anachronistic scenario of the court acting collectively on the basis of certain principles, and then representing them back to itself in order to legitimate them,” cited affirmatively by Pollock 2006: 18, 517-24, Bakker 2010: 5f. Fn. 18, and others.

⁶⁵ Evidently, Geertz uses the attributes “political” and “cultural/aesthetic” here liberally, and not in a theoretically controlled way. Cf. Weber’s 1922 idealtypical contrast between “exemplary” and “ethical” prophecy.

⁶⁶ How these different forms of power (capital) relate to political power is not entirely clear, except that, for Bourdieu 2012/2014: 192, “[t]he political field is the field par excellence for the exercise of symbolical capital; it is a place where to exist, to be, is to be perceived.” In his analysis, the “ruling fraction” in today’s France derives “if not its power, at least the legitimacy of its power from educational capital acquired in formally pure and perfect academic competition, rather than directly from economic capital” (Bourdieu 1979/1998: 315).

⁶⁷ Power cannot really be owned, since it is not an individual attribute or possession, as the causal models of power of Hobbes and the earlier sociological tradition argued. Power is first of all a relationship. This is recognised even by M. Weber 1922/1985: 28, 1968/1978: 68 in his famous “instrumental” definition of power as an “opportunity existing within a social relationship which permits one to carry out one’s own will even against resistance and regardless of the basis on which this opportunity rests.” On the notion of power as a code of communication see Luhmann 1979.

⁶⁸ Elsewhere, Bourdieu 1983: 45 describes the transition of relationships of personal dependency in premodern contexts of patronage (of art) to market mediated forms of patronage in modern France, where patronage has become predominantly a relationship of exchange between “financial capital” and “symbolical capital.”

At each juncture of such self-legitimising cycles of cultural reproduction, acts of patronage have a different function or meaning. Hence, strictly speaking, it makes no sense to investigate “patronage” in general. The practical problem for the historian of South Asia is of course that the identification of the specific contextual meaning of an Indic term that could be rendered into English as “patronage” is often difficult, if not impossible, if only a few historical traces remain. In cases of scarce evidence, at best a range of “typical meanings” of a term describing “patronage” transactions can be supplied.

This brief review of important discussions on different types of patronage in South Asia and elsewhere underscores the aforementioned point that patronage of religion, poetry, and art in South Asia is in the literature mainly understood as politically motivated gift-giving, whether the agents are imagined as atomised individuals or as embodiments of cultural types. However, a development in the conceptualisation of “patronage relationships” can be observed, from a focus on the “giver” to a focus on the “receiver,” the “interaction between giver and receiver,” and finally cycles of self-legitimising cultural reproduction. There is a growing awareness of the influence of different social structures and cyclical processes of cultural reproduction, of which acts of “patronage” are but a part, which can function at the same time as means of one-sided accumulation.

5. “Patronage” and Role-Types in the Jaina-Tradition

One of the few dedicated studies of “patronage” in the Jaina tradition, an article of P. Granoff (1994-5), focuses on “gift giving” (*dāna*) in the context of temple construction. In line with current academic usage, the word *dāna* is treated as a functional equivalent, if not synonym, of the ambiguous English term “patronage.”⁶⁹ The fact that the dictionaries do not translate the word *dāna* in this way demonstrates yet again the unspecific, sociologically under-theorised nature of the umbrella term “patronage.” Granoff’s article establishes, first of all, the multi-layered relationships of “patronage” involved in the construction of a Jaina temple, which requires the permission of the overlord and of the landowner to begin with, and the blessings (*āśīrvāda*) and finally the presence of monks to consecrate the building and the images it houses. Usually, a community committee (*goṣṭhika*) is formed under the leadership of the main financial sponsor to assure the accomplishment of the complex tasks involved (p. 269), with “careful attention to political relationships, economic contracts and community responsibilities” (p. 288). The terminology of patronage, here mainly used in the general sense of “giving support,” is not further explored, but implicitly a distinction between political, economic, and social-cultural forms of patronage has been advanced.

Based on some fifty cases recorded in standard collections of medieval Jaina inscriptions, such as Jinavijaya’s (1917, 1921) *Prācīnajainalekhasaṃgraha* and Vijayadharmaśūri’s and Vidyāvijaya’s (1929) *Prācīnalekhasaṃgraha*, Laughlin (2003a: 136-60) makes the significant observation that the bestowal of recorded material gifts (*dravya-dāna*) by Jaina monks was by no means unusual. According to him, “some Jain monks, throughout Jain history, possessed at least a modest amount of money” (p. 156). The possibility that something was “given” by a monk or nun, but paid for by a layperson, can, of course, not be ruled out. A closer investigation of the corpus of Jaina inscriptions in this respect is clearly needed.⁷⁰ Even if the number of cases is relatively small, Laughlin’s evidence shows that in practice, if not in theory, there is no compelling evidence for assuming the theoretically neat analogy *spiritual patronage* : *material patronage* :: *mendicant* : *householder* to be universally evident.

While a detailed historical investigation of the terminology used in the Jaina sources remains a desideratum to which the Jaina-Prosopography will also contribute by recording proper names and role-type designations used in the sources, details of which cannot be addressed here, at first glance, terms such as the following seem to prevail in Jaina texts, as designations for aspects of different role-types associated with “patronage” relationships. Usually, they are associated with acts of giving or giving-up something material, immaterial or

⁶⁹ On the rules and regulations and stories of gift-giving in the Jaina context, besides the rules for the begging round, see further Williams 1963 and Balbir 1982.

⁷⁰ The main evidence cited by Laughlin is restricted to the Mūrtipūjaka traditions in Rajasthan from the 11th to the 19th century. One case in Klatt 2016 is discussed below.

metaphorical, that is, “the gift of knowledge,” “the gift of fearlessness,” besides “the [material] gift in support of religion,” frequently distinguished in Jaina scriptures, apparently with regard to the different status of mendicants and householders (who alone can offer material prestations).⁷¹ There are many, partly overlapping, terms⁷² in Jaina texts for “the act of giving” besides *dāna* (*pradāna*, *saṃpradāna*, *tyāga*, *visarjana*, etc.), the “object,” “gift” or “favour,” given (up), bestowed or transmitted (*anugraha*, *bhikṣā*, *deya*, *grahaṇaka*, *prābhṛta*, *pradāna*, *prasāda* = “grace, favour,” *pratigraha*, *tyāga*, *upacāra*, *upahāra*, etc.), and the roles of “giver” besides *dātṛ* (*dāyaka*, *pradātṛ*, etc.) and of “receiver” besides *grāhaka*⁷³ (*ādātṛ*, *pātra* = “vessel,” *pratigrāhaka* /-in, *prāptaka*, *upadātṛ*, etc.).⁷⁴ Abstract objects or roles can only be designated with the help of abstract nouns. Since in the primary sources many roles are only implied by verbs such as “gives” or “ordered to be given,” role-types (as well as relationship-types) need to be coded in the first place with the help of observer categories, in order to account for all the evidence. In the *Jaina-Prosopography*, etic categories are defined in English with common Sanskrit-Hindi equivalents or indicative neologisms (both marked by “*”) for the dual purposes of role-disambiguation, and indication of equivalent terms employed by catalogues and databases in South Asia. Alternative emic role- and relationship-descriptions are related to the generalised etic English and Sanskrit-Hindi terminology as empirical variants.

The *Jaina-Prosopography* records *all emic terms* used in the texts as role-descriptions, but only in their generic form. not covering all linguistic variations.⁷⁵ The terms can be investigated by researchers from various analytical perspectives. Listed in the following are generic terms used, amongst others, some of which are often found in Jaina literature and catalogues, which usually employ a mix of Sanskrit and Hindi words. The first four and numbers six and eight of the following role-types, recorded in the *Jaina-Prosopography*, which could be associated with “patronage,” are in a Jaina context predominantly, if not exclusively, associated with mendicants:

GENERIC TERMS FOR ROLE-TYPES REGARDING “PATRONAGE-” RELATIONSHIPS IN JAINA-SOURCES ⁷⁶		
1	Protector	*nīśraya- / āśraya-dātṛ
2	Motivator	*preraka
3	Adviser	*upadeśaka
4	Appointer	*niyukti-karṭṛ
5	Appointee	*niyukta-vyakti
6	Consecrator	*abhiṣeka-karṭṛ ⁷⁷
7	Honourer	*puraskāra-pradātṛ ⁷⁸
8	Guardian	*saṃrakṣaka
9	Requester	*prārthaka
10	Donor	*dātṛ
11	Receiver	*grāhaka
12	Promoter	*puraskāra-karṭṛ
13	Sponsor	*prayojaka ⁷⁹
14	Community leader	*saṃgha-pati

⁷¹ E.g. TŚPC 1.1.153, in Balbir 1982: 87 Fn. 2: “La loi du don est reconnue de trois sortes: don de connaissance [*jñāna-dāna*], don de sécurité [*abhaya-dāna*] et don-soutien-de-la-Loi [*dharmōpagraha-dāna*].” Cf. Fn. 74.

⁷² Here given only in Sanskrit. See *infra*.

⁷³ See Balbir 1982: 85. In Pkt. *gāhaga*. In Hindi, the receiver is often called *prāptikartā*.

⁷⁴ See Bollée 2015.

⁷⁵ In a recent exemplary manuscript catalogue, Hinüber 2013: 223-45 gives also only indicative extracts of the vocabulary found in the sources.

⁷⁶ For objects see *infra*.

⁷⁷ Cf. *saṃskartṛ*, *abhimantraṇakṛt*, *abhiṣecaka*, etc.

⁷⁸ Cf. *saṃmāna-pradātṛ* and the more informal role of the *saṃbodhana-pradātṛ*, who performs merely an act of recognition, without official status implications reflected in the name of the honoree or a material award.

⁷⁹ The partly synonymous term *pravartaka* is mainly used in the monastic sphere as a designation for the position of overseer.

15	Dedicatee	*°samarpita ⁸⁰
16	Intended reader of a sponsored text	*°paṭhanārtha ⁸¹
17	Intended beneficiary of the merit generated	*°śreyōrtha ⁸²
	Etc.	

The Jainas seem to have preferred (*saṃ-*) *rakṣaṇa* (Pkt. [*saṃ-*] *rakkhaṇa*) for “worldly protection / patronage,” and the three synonyms *niśraya* (Pkt. *ṇissā, ṇissaya*), *āśraya* (Pkt. *āsaya*), and *śaraṇa* (Pkt. *saraṇa*) (refuge, shelter, protection, support) for “spiritual protection / patronage.” As a frequently employed second component of names of Jinas and Jaina mendicants, who are generally likened to kings, the term °*nātha* (Pkt. *nāha*) (protector, patron, lord, as in Pārśva-nātha), which became popular at some stage, is also worth mentioning. The only distinction that is clearly demarcated in the terminology is the one between “worldly patron” and “spiritual patron,” here differentiated as “protector” and “guardian.” The terms *āśraya*, *niśraya*, *śaraṇa*, etc., are almost exclusively employed with reference to monks or nuns. The paradigmatic act of offering protection and support, however, is *dāna*, or “giving,” a term that, as we have seen, is not translated as “patronage” in the dictionaries, and hence at best regarded as its functional equivalent. The archetypal Jaina householder, and champion of material support, is Indra, the Jaina king of the gods, who in Jaina culture is portrayed as “the paradigm of Jain temple patronage” from early on (Laughlin 2003b: 318). A number of other terms are significant for the study of the semantic field of Jaina material “patronage,” although no dictionary will include them under this category. The *saṃghapati*, above all, is usually a wealthy layman who sponsors a pilgrimage or other communal religious activities. In regard to this function, he can be classified as the “patron” par excellence. This inference cannot be automatically drawn in the case of the *sabhāpati*, who presides over an assembly or council.

Not so clear are the precise implications of the words pointing in general ways to either spiritual or worldly patronage (protection, support).⁸³ As the following analysis of the uses of the term “patronage” in A. Weber’s (1891) catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit manuscripts at the Royal Library in Berlin and in Klatz’s (1892/2016) *Jaina-Onomasticon* demonstrates, the quality of the relationship can often only be inferred with varying degrees of uncertainty. Occasionally, a compound is used to specify the attributes of a particular act, as in the expression *dravya-dāna*. Yet, more often than not, no further details are given. A scholar who is familiar with the characteristic formats of Jaina historical sources may be able to judge fairly accurately what kind of relationship might be indicated by a particular term in a given context. But a considerable degree of uncertainty remains. The kind of “patronage” offered by one mendicant to another, spiritual or material, for instance, is rarely specified. The political protector of a religious undertaking is also rarely mentioned in accounts of donations by Jaina householders. General spiritual protection offered to lay-supporters by the head of a particular Jaina mendicant order is usually taken for granted, as well as the protection offered by the political ruler of the day. Moreover, not all “patrons” and “patronage” relationships involved in a given case are necessarily recorded.

The sources generally remain silent about the details of multiple relationships implied in an act of “patronage,” and focus on the main actor. Though, usually, there are several criss-crossing aspects involved in specific acts of “patronage,” often one and the same term is employed to designate some or all of them together, both in the primary sources and in modern (meta-) catalogues. The ambiguity of the word “patronage” and of Sanskrit (etc.) equivalents, used in isolation, helps masking the fact of missing detail, which a perfect prosopography would wish to record. In cases of doubt, where no word for “patronage” is used, only a general relationship can be recorded in a prosopographical database, as in the case of the paradigmatic “protective” ruler and his subjects. The best is to record the terms actually used in the primary sources in brackets behind an English translation or vice versa. In many cases, catalogues can only be used as pointers to the original which ideally needs to be consulted and double-checked. Yet, in most cases the original sources are equally opaque. The fact remains that

⁸⁰ Literally: “that which is donated (to) ___.”

⁸¹ Literally: “(text intended) for reading (by) ___.”

⁸² Literally: “(donation intended) for benefit (of) ___.” See Sircar 1966: 316 on °*śreyase*, “for the benefit of ___.”

⁸³ Compare the “Selected Scribal Remarks” in Balbir’s “Introduction” to Balbir, K.V. Sheth, K.K. Sheth & Tripathi 2006: 136-57, cf. 66-8.

records on different types of “patronage” are more ambiguous and difficult to code than information on monastic lineages and succession, or data on personal networks.

Tutelage of a novice by an established Jaina monk or other forms of protection and support extended by and for religious virtuosi are rarely, if ever, considered as relevant to studies of “patronage” in the literature. The focus is almost exclusively on *dravya-dāna*, that is, “material charity,” “-gift-giving” or “-donation.” In the context of Hinduism, *dakṣiṇā*, the “fee,” “gift” or “donation” to Brahmin priests also plays a prominent role. The ancient scriptures of the Jainas, of course, do not use the term *dakṣiṇā*. They also do not regard the act of giving to mendicants as an element of a cycle of reciprocity, or as comparable with giving alms to beggars, but as a one-sided gift to a superior being, offered both for its physical maintenance and as a symbolic act representing Jaina values. To emphasise the one-sidedness of the gift, to be renounced with no expectation of return, Jainas prefer to use more precise terms such as *bhikṣā-dāna*, “gift of alms.” The word *bhikṣā* is used both to designate the “alms” given by householders, as well as the “alms” asked for and received by mendicants. To distinguish the act of giving alms from the act of begging alms, the suffix °*dāna* is usually added to *bhikṣā*° in the former case, and the suffixes °*karāṇa* or °*cara* in the latter case. Although *bhikṣā* is given to mendicants as a “free gift,” without expectation of return, the act of *dāna* is considered to be self-gratifying: thus it “works both ways.”⁸⁴ Conditional on the mental orientation of the giver, and on the manner of giving, it is believed to produce merit (*puṇya*), that is, “good karman,” and at the same time to destroy “bad karman,” besides contributing to the social status of the giver.

The vocabulary was originally centred on the perspective of the mendicants. In medieval times, lists of legitimate “fields of giving” (*dāna-kṣetra*) were drawn up by monks, some of which included even Jaina laity as qualified recipients, which of course is disputed, not least by the *a-mūrtipūjaka* traditions, which also reject the construction of temples and images, as a matter of principle. The best-known list is the *mūrtipūjaka* Ācārya Hemacandra’s 12th century account of seven “fields of giving” in *Yogaśāstra* (YŚ) 3.120.⁸⁵

RECIPIENTS WORTHY OF ALMS-GIVING	
Jaina images (construction, rituals etc.)	jina-bimba
Jaina temples (construction, restoration etc.)	jina-bhavana
Jaina scriptures (copying & giving)	jina-āgama
Monks (almsgiving)	sādhu
Nuns (almsgiving)	sādhvī
Laymen (religious infrastructure, life-cycle rituals, ceremonies, charity, etc.)	śrāvaka
Laywomen (dito)	śrāvikā

If these can be considered the main fields of legitimate “material patronage” (*dravya-dāna*), that is, of merit-producing acts of religious giving in image-venerating Śvetāmbara Jainism, there are other lists, which include, for instance, the right intention (*bhāva*) of the giver, such as the intended “purpose of generating merit” (*puṇyārtha*), often mentioned in inscriptions.⁸⁶ The following five factors can be said to be agreed across sects to be considered as regards to the act of giving itself:

FACTORS OF GIVING	
Recipient	pātra
Giver	dātr

⁸⁴ Variation of the explanation “honouring works both ways” which Vinod Kapashi in London gave me many years ago in the context of a discussion on public honouring, which is popular amongst Jains. It stuck in my mind. On public honouring in the (Terāpanth) Jaina tradition, see Flügel 1995-6: 156.

⁸⁵ Cf. Williams 1963: 165. On lists of permitted gifts see also Balbir 1982: 88.

⁸⁶ TS 7.39 (no. 1-4), Vasunandin *Śrāvākācāra* 220, according to Williams 1963: 150. See also Hemacandra’s TŚPC 1.1.175, in Balbir 1982: 87, on the five factors of giving in support of religion (*dharmōpagraha-dāna*) (cf. TŚPC 1.1.153, in Fn. 61): the purity of the giver (*dāyaka*), receiver (*grāhaka*), the thing given (*deya*), the moment (*kāla*) and of the intention (*bhāva*) of the giver.

Object given (shelter, food, medicine, knowledge, etc.)	dātavya, dravya ⁸⁷
Manner of giving	dāna-vidhi
Result of giving	dāna-phala

Spiritual protection is designated by another compound of °dāna, namely *abhaya-dāna*, the already mentioned “gift of fearlessness,” as well as by other terms. *Abhaya-dāna* cannot really be classified as a form of “patronage,” however, because it is generally not used as a designating of a relation between individuals. The giving of fearlessness is rather a standard quality attributed to all proper Jaina mendicants. It is considered to be freely available to everyone in the presence of a well-behaved mendicant, and not directed to one or more specified receiver. Hence, *abhaya-dāna* is only metaphorically a form of “patronage.” Whether benedictions (*āśīrvāda*) could be interpreted as forms of protective “patronage,” as they are from a participant’s point of view, is open for debate, because they can be bestowed either in a pointed or in an indiscriminate manner. The criterion is always whether it is directed to a specific receiver or not. Despite Borooah’s (1877) focus on the role of the one who offers respect (*saṃbhāvayitr*), on the face of it, the Jaina act of honouring (*vandanā*) the *guru* represents neither a form of protection nor of support, though it implies such a relationship. The act of public honouring (*puraskāra* or *saṃmānakāra*) of an individual by the *guru*, by contrast, can easily be interpreted as a form of “patronage.” The different forms of “protection and support” have not yet been addressed in studies of “patronage” in South Asia. A complete list of “objects given,” beyond the standard lists of objects that, according to scripture and tradition, can be “given” to Jaina mendicants, and laity, would include items as diverse as the following (Sanskrit terms are indicative):

Given name	nāman
Office, title of office	adhikāra
Honour, title of honour	sammāna
Ornament, decorative title	alaṃkāra
Blessing	āśīrvāda
Etc.	

Even if it is decided to restrict a study of “patronage” to cases of “material support,” in line with current practice, it will be difficult to unequivocally identify cases of “material support” among single word references to some kind of “support” in the texts. To be able to discriminate different forms of “Jaina-patronage,” that is, in a narrow sense, material support of Jaina community members and Jaina religious projects, it is of course important to be familiar with the Jaina terminology pertaining to gift-giving, which here could only be indicated in a cursory manner to illustrate the complexities of the apparently easy task of identifying “patronage” relationships in the sources, and of representing it a prosopographical database which, after all, needs to reflect the full range of variations.

For the reasons given, the *Jaina-Prosopography* has no dedicated field for “patronage.” Instead it uses an expandable list of “role-types,” based on standardised emic terms found in the sources, some of which have been discussed. These can be linked to events and named individuals and groups, locations, times, etc. It will be the task of the researcher to select variables from this list to construct one or other type of “patronage” in view of a specific research question.

6. Coding Schemes used in Jaina Manuscript and Epigraphic Catalogues

The foundations for the new digital methodologies have already been laid in the early days of modern indological and epigraphical exploration of the South Asian cultural heritage, with the creation of registers,

⁸⁷ Amongst the many terms used for a gift, the Persian-Urdu word *bakhshīsh*, is noteworthy.

catalogues, and indexes, informed by explicit or implicit coding schemes. This section will explore some of the earliest meta-data on “patron-client relationships” in standard manuscript catalogues, focussing on the indices of Albrecht Weber’s (1886, 1888, 1891) *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prākṛit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, Zweiter Band*, Johannes Klatt’s (1892/2016) *Jaina-Onomasticon*, and Hiralal R. Kapadia’s (1954) *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collection of Manuscripts Deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. XVII, V*. The coding systems of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* of the University of Madras (1949ff.), Jaina library catalogues, and some of the latest first-stage prosopographical data-bases, such as the electronic catalogues of Sanskrit and Prakrit manuscripts at the Wellcome Institute in London, of the Woolner Collection in Lahore, PANDIT, and the exemplary electronic *Catalogue of Jain Manuscripts at Kōbā Tīrtha* in Gāndhīnagar,⁸⁸ to name but a few, have also been studied, but cannot be discussed in this essay. It was expected that the comparison of the different methodological approaches of the great cataloguers of Indian literature might help generating a sophisticated set of categories for the computer-supported exploration of sociology of the Jaina tradition and knowledge production that is compatible with first-stage prosopographical catalogues. “Patronage” is just one of many parameters to be considered, but a crucial one.

A. Weber’s Index of Authors of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in Berlin

In the last volume of part two of his *Verzeichniss* Vol. 2.1-3, Albrecht Weber (1891) presented for the first time a proto-prosopographical coding scheme for the historical, geographical, social, and biographical information embedded in the colophons of the manuscripts, predominantly Jaina, that he had studied, partly transcribed, and catalogued. Most of the indexes in this volume mirror the indexes Weber (1853) had created for the first part of his pioneering reference work, which in due course became a paragon for cataloguing Oriental manuscripts. The two sets of indexes are books in themselves, comprising 94 and 144 page respectively. Apart from catalogue numbers, the following subjects are covered by both:

1. Manuscripts
 - 1.1 Date
 - 1.2 Place
2. Scribes, Relatives & Patrons
3. Works
4. Authors, Relatives & Patrons
5. Subjects

A closer look at the structure of the indexes reveals, firstly, that the second set of indexes is much more detailed and extensive, and, secondly, that despite the distinction between scribes and authors, and different calendar systems, there is still a considerable degree of amalgamation of different types of information within one or other index in the second set of indexes. Conspicuous in this respect is Index 1891d: “Alphabetical list of the authors, their works, relatives, and patrons,” which is of significance for the question of coding “patronage” relationships.⁸⁹

Weber’s (1953: 392-478, 1891: 1233-1361) indexes are presented under the following headings:

1853:

- a. The dates of the manuscripts in chronological sequence, besides information on place and scribe
- b. Overview of the regions and places, in which manuscripts are written, or from where the authors originate, in the sequence of the year
- c. Manuscripts in which the year is missing, which offer details on the place, the scribe, etc.
- d. Alphabetical list of the scribes of the manuscripts, their relatives, and patrons

⁸⁸ In parts published: Padmasāgarasūri 2003-13.

⁸⁹ See *infra*.

- e. Alphabetical list of the authors of the manuscripts, their relatives, patrons, and works
- f. Alphabetical list of the individual texts
- g. Alphabetical list of the subjects and names covered or mentioned

1891:

- a. Date and origin of the manuscripts
 - i. Date of their arrival in the Royal Library and information on the source of supply
 - ii. Date of production of copies
 - 1. According to the Vikrama-Era
 - 2. According to the Śālivāhana-Era
 - 3. According to the Nepālese-Era
 - 4. According to the Bengal-Era
 - 5. According to the Muslim-Era
 - 6. According to the Christian-Era
 - 7. Without Era
 - iii. Place of origin of the manuscripts, or rather scribes
- b. Alphabetical list of the scribes of the manuscripts, their relatives, and patrons
- c. Alphabetical list of the work-titles
- d. Alphabetical list of the authors, their works, relatives, and patrons
Geographical names mentioned here
- e. Alphabetical list of the subjects, names, etc., covered or mentioned

Index 1891d is significant, because on p. 1258 Fn. 1, it introduces for the first time a coding system for marking up information on different types of social relationships and roles in the manuscripts.⁹⁰ This set of codes enables Weber to present complex information in a nested index structure, which under the proper name of a particular individual lists the names of associated individuals and texts. The nature of the link is indicated in each known case with the help of ten acronyms of named variables for the presentation of prosopographical data from the catalogued manuscripts.

⁹⁰ Deleu 1970: 319 uses the following codes in his *Index of Proper Names*: “Abbreviations: *a.* = annautthiya (dissident), *A.* = Arhat, *Ā.* = Ājīviya, *b.* = brahman, *d.* = disciple of Mv., *h.* = householder, *k.* = king, *l.* = layman or -woman, *m.* = monk, *n.* = nun, *P.* = Pāsāvaccijja, *p.* = prince(ess), *q.* = queen, *r.* = race, *t.* = traveller (disācara).” No other coding of the name indexes of Jaina catalogues is known to the present writer.

6. alphabetisches Verzeichniß¹⁾ der Autoren, ihrer Werke,
Verwandten und Patrone.

- *Akabbara (Akbar), K., Jinacandra 1708, — s. p. 267
 - , Çānticandra 1847, — s. p. 592
 - , Jinacandra 1911, — s. p. 742.
 1213
 - , Hiravijaya 1968, — s. p. 938
 - , Hiravijaya 1991, — s. p. 1066
 - , Hiravijaya 2016, — s. p. 1108
 Agastya, -saṃhitā (skandapur.) 1525
 Agnisvāmin, C. Lāṭyāyana 1428
 Acchupta-dhanapati 1781
 - -dhanin 1789
 Aja(ya)pāla, K. (s. 1232) 1744, — s. p. 1209
 Ajitadeva 2025
 Ajitasinha 1781
 - zwei dergl. 1938, s. Cāndra
 *Amcalagacha (Mānikyasūrisuṃdara) 1604, — s. p. 1205. 1212
 Aṇuratnamaṇḍana, irrig für aṇu-R° 1722
 Anaṅgaharsha, K. tāpasa-Vatsarāja 2166
 Ananta, K. (Sūryavati) 1569
 Anantadeva, V. Vallabhadeva s. p. 1204
 Anantabhaṭṭa, Sch. Nāgadeva, C. Vs.prātiç. 2060
 Anantabhaṭṭopādhyāya, tarkasaṃgraha 2207
 Anubhūtiśvarūpa, sārvasvatī prakriyā 2216
 Annambhaṭṭa, tarkasaṃgraha 2205. 2206
 - , C. Vs.prātiç. 2060
 Appadikshita, kuvalayānanda 2229
 Abhayacandra, L. Rāmacandra (s. 1490) 1580
 *Abhayadeva (s. 1120), C. aṅga 3 1781/82
 - (s. 1120), aṅga 4 1786
 - (s. 1128), aṅga 5 1789
 *Abhayadeva (s. 1120), aṅga 6 1792/93
 - aṅga 7 1802-4
 - aṅga 8 1809
 - aṅga 9 1811-12
 - aṅga 7-9 2301
 - aṅga 10 1817
 - upāṅga 1 1826-28
 - navāṅgivrīttikṛit, Rudrapalliyagacha, Cāndrakula 2006, — s. p. 1088
 - , L. Hemacandrasūri 1899, — s. p. 699
 - , L. Çāntyācārya 1910, — s. p. 827
 - , Candragacha, L. des Dhaneçvara, Sch. des Pradyumna, Verf. des vādamahārṇava und der sammatīṭikā 1938, — s. p. 851. 1214. 1215
 - , Maladhāri, L. Candrasūri 1950, — s. p. 895
 - , L. des Paramānanda 1951, — s. p. 902
 Abhayanandin, C. Jainendravayākaraṇa 1634
 Abhayasinha, V. des Rāmasinha 1987, — s. p. 1216 (s. 1781-1806)
 Abhayasūri, vādīsīnha 2006, — s. p. 1088
 Abhayasoma, L. des Harsharāja 1961
 Abhinavagupta (AD 993-1015), tantrāloka 1772
 - , mahāmāheçvarakavi, ekāvālī 1723
 Amarasinha, koça 2222-23
 - , K. 2269
 Amitagati, dharmaparīkshā 2019
 Ammaeva (!), L. des Nemicandra 1936
 ayya(ārya)Sāma(Çyāmārya),pannavāṇā1837-40

¹⁾ Br. Bruder, C. Commentar, K. König, L. Lehrer, M. Mutter, N. Neffe, P. Patron, S. Sohn, Sch. Schüler, V. Vater; — ein * bedeutet, daß der Name schon in Index 4 vorkommt.

Only selected aspects of the data at hand have been coded by Weber in this way, evidently reflecting frequency of occurrence, and perceived utility for specialised readers. Weber's coding system focuses on kinship roles within the patrilineage, key roles within mendicant teacher-disciple lineage, kingship, patronage (arguably two forms of "patronage" are implicitly distinguished: "royal protection" and "sponsorship"), as well as on the special status of a text as commentary (and of its author as "commentator" by implication). A role-type, for the "recipient" or "client" of "patronage" is not included, because Weber evidently regarded the corresponding role to be implied. By contrast, the reciprocal roles of "father" and "son," "teacher" and "disciple" are explicitly coded.

The uses of the terms “teacher” and “disciple” are remarkably imprecise, both in the primary sources and in Weber’s index. “Teacher” is a relational term that in the Jaina context can designate either the “head of the order” (*paṭṭadhara*), the “personal guru” (if different), or the “academic teacher” (if different). The ambiguity is not merely a translation issue, since the title *ācārya* can refer to the role-types “head of the order” or “teacher,” or both. Even more vague is the term “patron,” as we have seen, in Weber’s list as well, since the king K. can also be a patron P. The fact that Weber never put a P. next to the name of a king suggests that he implicitly distinguishes between “political protection” and “economic patronage,” at least in this context:

AUTHORS, RELATIVES, AND PATRONS			
Acronym	Social Role	=	Type of Role
V. =	Vater	Father	Relative
M. =	Mutter	Mother	
S. =	Sohn	Son	
Br. =	Bruder	Brother	
N. =	Neffe	Nephew	
L. =	Lehrer	Teacher	Monastic Relationship
Sch. =	Schüler	Disciple	
C. =	Commentar	Commentary (-> Commentator)	Type of Text (-> Author)
K. =	König	King	Ruler
P. =	Patron	Patron	Patron

The parallel index for “scribes” in Weber (1891: 1243-8) does not use a coding system, which for the index for authors may have been developed after the ambiguities in this list became apparent, with no time left for re-setting the index for scribes, which instead offers a narrative description of the data in the final paragraph on p. 1248, reproduced below. The text points for instance to the interesting fact that female scribes are also on record.⁹¹

In diesen Angaben werden folgende Familien und Schulen erwähnt: die kula: Yadu, Vegada, die gacha: Añcala, Aukeṣa (Ūk.), Kuraṃḍa, Kharatara (bṛihat-Kh.), Dāhadā, Tapā, Pārṣvacandrasūri, bṛihad, Sārasvata, die gaṇa: balātkāra, maladhāri, die gotra: Ratnapurā-vuharā, Vaṇṭhikā, Ṣaṅkhavāla; — bei genaueren Angaben werden hie und da auch die Gattinnen (bhāryā) angeführt, s. z. B. 1899. 1988.

Mehrfach ist von Bibliotheken, bhāṇḍāgāra, die Rede; so z. B. 1915 (s. 1490): adye 'ha Ṣripattane ṣṛiJinabhadrasūriṣvarāṇaṃ bhāṇḍāgāre ... likhāpitā, 2238 mahārājādhirāja Caulukyacūḍāmaṇi ṣṛi Mahimalladevasya bhāratibhāṇḍāgāre, 2020 ṣṛi Thāra Hirajñi bhāṇḍāra, cf. bhāṇḍāreṣvara 1539, bhāṇḍāria 1948. — Die Gnade (prasāda) der speciell genannten Gottheiten, welche den Schreiber bei seiner Arbeit unterstützten (cf. 1539. 1726. 1736. 1944. 1981. 2021. 2041) bezieht sich wohl auf Tempel derselben, für die er schrieb. — Die Namen derer, für welche eine Handschrift copirt ward, werden sehr häufig angeführt. Von einem ibhya Namens Udayasiṅha wird berichtet, dafs er die 45 āgama copiren liefs (1877 p. 638). — Auch weibliche Schreiber werden erwähnt, s. 1682 (s. p. 233). 1802. 1951. — Bildliche Darstellungen finden sich im Ganzen selten eingefügt, z. B. bei 1744. 1938.

In modernen Werken werden die Citate aus einem Werke gelegentlich nach den Blättern der dem Autor vorliegenden Handschrift desselben angeführt, s. p. 922^{n.2}. 963^{n.1}.

Die Mss. sind fast sämtlich in Devanāgarī geschrieben, ausgenommen 13 in Kashmir-Schrift (Ṣaradā) (1461. 1537. 1543. 1587. 1608. 1613. 1766. 1771. 2166. 2222. 2243^{ab}. 2303), vier in Nepālī (1591. 1592. 1606. 1769), vier in Teliṅga (1598. 1599. 1601. 1603), eines in Gurmukhī 1609, eines in Uriya 2178.

⁹¹ Weber 1891: 1248. A worthwhile subject for further study.

It seems that Weber used the code “P.” rather sparingly. Only ten cases have been marked up by him in this way (catalogue number and page number “s.p.” references are used), which indicates how much more difficult it is to find information on “patronage” in manuscripts, compared with donative inscriptions:

1. “Govardhanadhârirâja, K., S. des Toḍara, P. des Kṛishṇapaṇḍita 1556” (p. 1262),
2. “Padmacandra, Sch. des Jinaḡekhara 2006, P. des Candrakîrti 1639” (p. 1266),
3. “Paramânanda, Sch. des Abhayadeva, sâmyârîvihi 1951-, P. des Vinâyaka, çrâddhakalpalatâ 2280” (p. 1266),
4. “Raghunâtha, P. des Râmacandra 1463” (p. 1269),
5. “Lûṇiga, L. des Mahâdeva 2232, - s. p. 1205 - , P. des Caṇḍapâla 1588” (p. 1270),
6. “Vastupâla, P. des Udayaprabhadeva 1741 - s. p. 1205 († s. 1298). 1208. 1216” (p. 1270),
7. “Sûryavatî (°matî), P. des Somadeva 1573, - s. p. 162” (p. 1273),
8. “Harihara, K., P. des Cihnabhaṭṭa 1619 - , P. des Sâyaṇa 1473-75 [...] - s. p. 1208” (p. 1273),
9. “Harshadeva, K., P. des Somadeva s. p. 162” (p. 1273),
10. “Hema, S. des Rayaṇa (Ratnagaṇi), P. des Somatilaka 1932, - s. p. 1214” (p. 1274).

The list extracted from the index includes four patronage relationships between a Hindu king or queen and a poet (no-s. 1, 7, 8, 9),⁹² one between a Jaina lay person and Jaina monks (no-s. 5, 6), one either between a Jaina lay person and a Jaina monk or between two Jaina monks [?] (no. 10),⁹³ and four between two Jaina monks (no-s. 2, 3, 4, 5).⁹⁴ Documented relationships of, for example, King Akbar to Jaina *âcâryas* are not coded as “P.” but as “K.” which indicates the existence of an unspecified relationship between a king and a monk. Since Weber uses P. chiefly to qualify relations between kings and (monk-) poets and relationships between two monks, the question remains as to what kind of roles Weber classified under the term “patron”: protector, supporter, or both?⁹⁵

⁹² Weber 1891: did not code the queen Sûryavatî as “K.” despite the fact the he knew she was a queen (Weber 1886: 162), most likely because he did not introduce the codes “Q.” or “R.” (for “royal patronage”) in the first place. Somadeva was the Jaina mendicant author of the *Kathâsaritsâgara*. Klatt 1892/2016: 921 has not much on him. Cf. Bollée 2015.

⁹³ Cf. *infra* the comparison of overlapping cases with Klatt’s data.

⁹⁴ The fact that both Raghunâtha and Râmacandra were teacher and disciple of the “Vṛihal-Lauṅkâ-gaccha” (Bṛhat-Loṅkâ-gaccha) can only be verified through Klatt 1892/2016: 700. Though more interpretative options remain open, the Klatt’s data make it seem most likely that “Lûṇiyâ” (p. 738) and Caṇḍapâla (p.358) were both Jaina monks at the time of the described relationship.

⁹⁵ See *infra* for a comparison of Weber’s and Klatt’s approach.

<p>*Govardhana, âryāsaptaçati 1594 - , V. des Gaṅgādhara 1739 - , nyāyavodhini (Toḍara*) 2206 Govardhanadhārīrāja, K., S. des Toḍara, P. des Kṛishṇapaṇḍita 1556 Govardhanabhaṭṭa, L. des Raghunātha 2331 *Govinda, L. des Çaṅkara 2038 - , V. des Nilakaṇṭha 1510-22 Govindaçesha, Çeshagovinda, Baudhāy. agni- shṭoma 1453 Govindasyāmin, C. zu Baudhāyanadharmā 2051 Gaudapāda, āgamaçāstra 2113-17 Gauḍeçvara (Jnānottara), C. zu Çvetāçvat. 2134 Gautamaṅ gotram 1523 Gaurikānta Sārvabhauma, C. zu ānandalahari 1767 Ghanaçyāma, godānavidhi 2259 Caṇḍapāla, C. zu Damayantiçampū 1588, — s. p. 1205 (s. 1298) Caṇḍasiṅha 1588 Caṇḍāñçu 1423 Caṇḍeça, S. des Dohavi 1710 Caturveda-Prithūdakasvāmin, C. zu Brahma- gupta 1734 Candra (Tapā ts) p. 1002, s. Cāndra Candrakīrti, C. zu sārvasvatavyākaraṇa 1639 - , L. des Harshakīrti p. 1207 Candrakulinapravacana 1781, s. Cāndra Candragacha 2012, s. Cāndra Candraguru, Sch. des Prabhānanda 2006 Candraprabha 1938, s. Cāndra Candramahattara, saptatikā 1930, — s. p. 1214 Candraçukla, Bein. d. Mahādeva, L. d. Jaya- rāma 2269</p>	<p>Cāndrakula, . . Kautikākhye gaṇe, Cāndrakule, Vaṭodbhava Bṛihadgache, Nāgapuriyābhava Tapāprāptāvadāte, Devasūri (s. 1174), Pad- maprabha, Prasannaçaçibhṛit, Guṇasamudra, Jayaçekhara, Vajrasena, Hematilaka, Ratna- çekhara, Pūrṇacandra, Hemacandra, Ratna- sāgara, Hemasamudra, Hemaratna, Soma- ratna, Rājaratna, Candrakīrti (Nāgapuriya Tapāgachādhīrājabhaṭṭāraka), Harshakīrti 1639 - , Cāndre gache Dharmasūri, Hema- candra, Udayacandra, Devendra, Kanaka- prabha 1682 - , Cāndrakule, Jagaccandra (Tapā- cārya), Devasundara, Somasundara, Muni- sundara (Çyāma-Sarasvatī), Jayacandra, Ratnaçekhara, Caritraratna, Hemahaṅsa (s. 1514 Āçāpalli) 1741 - , Candrakule, Jagaccandra (Tapā), Somas., Munis., Jayac., Ratnaç., Lakṣmī- sāgara, Sumatisādhu, Suhemavimala (s. 1583), Harshakula 1777 - , Candrakulina, Vardhamāna, Bu- ddhisāgara, Abhayadeva, Ajitasinha (Jina- candra), Yaçodeva, Droṇa (Aṇahilapātaka, Achuptadhanin, s. 1120) 1781 - , Cāndre kule, Vardhamāna, Jine- çvara, Buddhisāgara, Jinacandra, Jina- bhādra, Yaçaçandra (Nirvṛitakula), Droṇa, Vimalagaṇi, Dāyikasutamāṇikya (s. 1128, Aṇahilapurānagare, Achuptadhanin) 1789 - , Candrakula, Vardhamāna, Jine- çvara, Abhayadeva, Droṇa (Aṇahilla) 1826</p>
---	--

H. R. Kapadia's Catalogue of Jaina-Manuscripts at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

The only other attempt at a systematic investigation of the social roles as represented in manuscript catalogues is H. R. Kapadia's (1954: 145) in Volume 17.5 of the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collection of Manuscripts Deposited at the BORI (Appendices)*.⁹⁶ Kapadia's list of social categories is more extensive than Weber's. It even includes deities, and, somewhat inconsistently, works, sections, and miscellanea:

⁹⁶ in a rudimentary form, parts of the first volumes of the New Catalogus Catalogorum of the University of Madras outline something similar:

"In addition to all this work, for facilitating future work and saving time I worked up also the material relating to a number of authors and works falling into large natural groups because of their inter-relation by family or teacher-pupil connections or by belonging to a common type or form of literature. These had to be brought together and worked upon irrespective of the alphabetical order in which the volumes had to be prepared. Alphabetical work continuously involves subject-wise work also. Thus material was prepared by me for works, authors and subjects spread over different alphabets upto the end' [emphasis added]" (Raghavan in NCC Vol. 4, University of Madras 1968: i-ii).

With specific regard to the contents of Jaina manuscripts, Balbir et al. 2006: 164ff. also point to the possibility to establish "chronograms" for data on pilgrimage, installing images, *sūri-mahotsavas*, sponsorship of ms.

- a. Deities,
- b. Kings, Queens, and Princes,
- c. Scribes,
- d. Schools and Sub-schools,
- e. Castes, Sub-castes and Lineages,
- f. Jaina Monks and Nuns,
- g. Jaina Laity,
- h. Non-Jaina House-holders,
- i. Works and their Sections, and
- j. Miscellanea.

Unfortunately, Kapadia did not develop a system of codes to be applied to the indexes of his manuscript catalogues. An analysis of the types of specific information he presents in his lists yield the following, more differentiated list of categories:

- a. Biographic: name, designation, [birth = “Samvat”], died, age,
- b. Kinship Relations: father / mother / wife / second wife / husband / son / daughter / brother / uncle / god-father / god-mother / descendent / progeny / relative / female relative of ___ ,
- c. Caste, Lineage & Family: of ___ anvaya / jñāti / gotra / kula / vaṃśa / lineage / family / royal family / surname,
- d. Occupation & Role: author, cowherd, goldsmith, grammarian, minister,
- e. Other Social Relations: friend / colleague / helper of ___ ,
- f. Spiritual Kinship: descendent / guru / pupil / 1st female pupil of ___ , vidyāguru of ___ ,
- g. Spiritual Seniority: senior / junior to ___ ,
- h. Succession: successor / predecessor of ___ ,
- i. Spiritual Disciplehood: devotee of ___ , śrāvaka of ___ ,
- j. Group Relation (monastic): founder / first apostle [/ member] of ___ , nun schismatic (nihnava), non-Jaina,
- k. Time: Samvat ___ , contemporary of ___ , flourished after ___ , earlier / not earlier / later / not later than ___ ,
- l. Place: native / visitor of ___ ,

The *Jaina-Prosopography* has taken advantage of these and other attempts to structure the vast materials in the form of extended indexes. However, it is mainly building upon the data compiled by Johannes Klatt.

J. Klatt’s *Jaina-Onomasticon*

J. Klatt’s (1892/2016) *Jaina-Onomasticon* is special, because it is not only a bibliography, and meta-catalogue, but also a proto-prosopographical index, offering structured bio-bibliographical data of varying quality, which can form the bedrock of a prosopographical database. His implicit prosopographical scheme can be schematically represented as follows:⁹⁷

Monastic name
 Given name
 Birth date
 Birth place
 Father
 Mother
 Family (kula, gotra)

⁹⁷ Flügel 2016: 108. Dundas 2007: 22 used a simplified version of Klatt’s schemes.

Sub-caste (jāti)
 Mendicant order (gaccha, gaṇa)
 Initiation date
 Initiation place
 Initiator / head of the order
 Date of consecration as ācārya / sūri
 Place of consecration as ācārya / sūri
 Date of death
 Place of death
 Accomplishments
 Remarkable historical events

In his “extracts” from two Mūrtipūjaka *paṭṭāvalīs* Klatt (1882) already used these categories. One example from the representation of information from the *Vidhipakṣa-paṭṭāvali-saṃgraha* in Klatt’s (1894: 175) penultimate publication illustrates how he extracted information for his *Jaina-Onomasticon* (emphasis added):

“48. Jayasinha-sūri, son of koṭi-dravya-dhanin Dahāda Śeṭha and Neḍī, born Saṃvat 1179, Kuṅkaṇa-dēse Sopārā-pura-pāṭaṇe, dīkshā 1193 (Mer. and Sat. 1197), sūri 1202, âchārya 1236, †1238, 79 years old [...].
 49. Dharmaghosha-sūri, son of Chandra vyavahārin, in Māhava-pura-nagara (Māru-deṣē) and of Rājalade, born Saṃvat 1208, dīkshā 1216, âchārya 1234, composed Satapadī (ashtādaśa-praśnottara-rūpa) Saṃvat 1263, † 1268, at the age of 59.”⁹⁸

7. Analysis of 38 cases of “patronage” in J. Klatt’s *Jaina-Onomasticon*

Klatt’s opus has 35 direct references to a “patron” or to “patronage.” For the purpose of this brief pilot study 3 other named relationships within the sample of keywords containing explicitly references to a “patron” or “patronage” were coded as “patronage”, yielding altogether 38 cases. Twice “celebration” is mentioned, indicating patronage (= material sponsorship) of a religious event, and once “installation,” indicating, in a not entirely clear manner, either (a) the act of appointing a monk by a householder, which is rarely the case, but not unheard of, (b) a ceremonial role during the installation ceremony, or (c) one or other form of financial sponsorship of the event. Because some of the same “patronage” relationships are mentioned more than once under different keywords, the raw figures had to be adjusted downward. The “patronage” extended by King Indrajit to the poet Keśavadāsa is mentioned twice: once under “Indrajit,” and once under the keyword of Keśavadāsa’s work “Rasikapriyā.” Similarly, the “patronage” extended by King Mahīpāla to the poet Rājaśekhara is mentioned again under each of Mahīpāla’s two synonyms “Herambapāla” and “Kṣitipāladeva.”⁹⁹ The “patronage” extended by King Harsa to Bāṇa is mentioned once under “Harṣadeva” and twice under “Harṣavardhanā,” the “patronage” extended by King Arikesarin to Pampa once under “Arikesarin” and once under “Pampa,” and the “patronage” extended by Vastupāla to Udayaprabhadevasūri is mentioned under each of the two names. In the final analytical table, the number of patrons was readjusted once more, because Klatt’s

⁹⁸ Attempts at classifying information for the production of concordances have been made in various context of Jaina research in the 19th century. Burgess 1903: 66, for instance, used the following codes to present information on the legendary Jaina-biographies:

“For sake of brevity the following particulars for each Arhat are given below in serial order viz.:

- (1) The *vimāna* or *vāhana* (heaven) from which he descended for incarnation.
- (2) Birthplace, and place of consecration or *dīkshā*.
- (3) Names of father and mother. (4) Complexion.
- (5) Cognizance *chihna* or *lāñchhaṇa*.
- (6) Height; and
- (7) Age.
- (8) Dīksha-vriksha or Bodhi tree.
- (9) Yaksha and Yakshinī, or attendant spirits.
- (10) First Gaṇadhara or leading disciple, and first Āryā or leader of the female converts.”

⁹⁹ He was a Gurjara-Pratihāra king and reigned ca. 913-944 (Tripathi 1989: 259).

sources recorded that Dālacandra (Ḍālcand) acted as patron twice - to Mathurānātha and Rāycand -, while Harṣa is said to have acted as “patron” to three different individuals: Bāṇa, Mayūra, and the Chinese Buddhist monk Hiuen Tsiang / Xuanzang (who describes Harṣa as a “Buddhist” in his report of his encounter with him in his work *Xiyu ji*).¹⁰⁰ This leaves 30 “patronage” relationships between 26 “patrons” and 28 “clients.”

Klatt (2016: 397) uses many other terms which may imply relationships of “patronage” of one kind or another. In the entry on King Jayasiṃhadeva of Gujarat (r. 1150-1199), for instance, the following highlighted phrases can be found:

“Jayamaṅgala **composed** Kavi-çikshā **under him**, ib. p. 68, Appendix p. 80 line 4. **Under his reign** Yaçodeva of the Ūkeça-gaccha **composed** VS 1174 in Aṇahilapāṭaka a commentary on Navatattva, [...] **gave** to Ānanda-sūri and Amaracandra-sūri of the Nāgendra-gaccha **the names** *vyāghra-çiçu* and *siṃha-çiçu*, ib. Appendix p. 18 verse 4. He **honoured** Dharmaghosha-sūri of the Pūrṇimā-gaccha, [...] **Converted** by *vādi*-Deva Jayasiṃhadeva **erected** VS 1183 in Pattana a *Ṛishabha-prāsāda*.”

Roles and relationships described by ambiguous expressions such as these have been ignored in the analysis, in view of limits of time and space. In Klatt, the formulation “under him” invariably refers to the secular or religious head of a social unit, i.e. the secular or spiritual patron/protector. “Erected” could refer, for instance, to a founder (*sthāpaka*), sponsor (*prāyojaka*), or donor (*dātā*). The most likely it refers to a “sponsor.” The bestower of honorific titles such as “tiger among pupils/scholars” (*vyāghra-śiṣu*) or “lion among pupils/scholars” (*siṃha-śiṣu*) could be labeled as “name-giver” (*nāma-pradātr*) or as “honourer.”¹⁰¹ The “honourer” could be labelled with the Sanskrit terms *puraskāra*- (award) or *saṃmāna*- (honour) *pradātr*. Links of “patronage” between individuals that are mentioned more than once, such as the one between Mahīpāla and Rājaśekhara, are compressed into a single entry in the table, hence achieving a reduction of complexity. A fuller analysis of the information on “patronage” in the *Jaina-Onomasticon* will be offered in the *Jaina-Prosopography* database.

In the following, colour-coded keys were used, in preference to TEI-style tags, to highlight the main keywords that were coded for this pilot prosopographical analysis of a sample of published data in preparation of the relational database. The object produced by the “client,” usually a text, is not highlighted to paint the text sample not in too many colours. Codes can of course be changed, in accordance to different research designs, which will lead to slightly different results. However, for purposes of basic descriptive statistics of the data on “patronage” in the *Jaina-Onomasticon* they seem to be fairly uncontroversial. The most complex relationship-type recorded in the material can be modelled in form of “events” and “role-types” as follows:

Main Event X - Performed by A - Requested by C - Inspired by D - Patronised by E - Sponsored by F - for G

“Event X” for can for instance refer to an encounter, a ceremony, or the production, or transaction of something. Typical examples are the acts (events) of “composing a text,” “publishing a book,” “giving a book,” or

“installing a monk.” The categories mainly differentiate types of patrons and types of clients involved in the recorded process of production of some object or event. Needless to say that both action and agent can be in the plural. Agents can be individuals and institutions. The following categories cover much of the variation in the given data-set. However, the objects produced or transmitted are not coded in order to avoid cluttering the text with meta-data in this preliminary analysis. Not included are also links of kinship, succession, friendship, and other social relationships:

- Requesting Agent (purple)

¹⁰⁰ See Deeg 2007: 43 (=418) for a critical assessment of the document as “a piece of historical information.”

¹⁰¹ Cf. Flügel 2018a.

- Inspiring Agent (n/a)¹⁰²
- Act of Patronage (red)
- Royal Patron (green)
- Ministerial Patron (ochre)
- Business Class- / Wealthy Patron (*ibhya*, etc.) (brown)
- Monastic Patron (pink)
- Client (blue)
- Beneficiary (olive)

The following analysis results from the application of these codes.¹⁰³ Supplementary information from the *Jaina-Onomasticon*, which Klatt (2016) did not cross-reference in his manuscript, is provided in the footnotes. The relevant keywords are presented in (Indian) alphabetical sequence:

ABHAYODAYAGAṆI *Samvigna-panḍita*,¹⁰⁴ patron of Gajasāra-gaṇi who wrote Vicāra-shaṭ-triṅçikā¹⁰⁵ under Jinahaṅsa-sūri (VS 1555 – 82), MITRA 1888: 19 line 13.¹⁰⁶

ARIKESARIN [Klatt p. 234] *Mahāsāmanta*, of the Cālukya-kula, father of Yaçodhara (Çaka 881), PETERSON 1884: 47 – 8, 156 line 5. Patron of the Canarese poet Pampa (Çaka 863) who composed Ādi-purāṇa and Pampa-bhārata, see RICE 1882^b: 21, RICE 1883^b: 299 – 300, RICE 1884^a: Introduction p. XIV, FLEET 1882^b: 39 note. Arikesarin, of the Çilāhāra dynasty, Çaka 939, INDRAJĪ 1878^a: 1 – 17.¹⁰⁷

ARJUNADEVA Or Arjunavarmadeva, Paramāra king of Mālava, patron of Āçādhara’s (about VS 1250 – 1300) son Chāhaḍa (Bāhala), see PETERSON 1884: 85 note, BHANDARKAR 1887: 103, 390 verse 2. Inscriptions of VS 1267, VS 1270, VS 1272, see HALL 1860^b: 24 – 47, KIELHORN 1890^a: 24, 31. Son of Sohaḍa (Subhaṭa), see Merutuṅga’s Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, RĀMACANDRA 1888: 250 line 4, Peterson 1886: 5 – 7.

INDRAJIT Son of Rāmasāhi, prince of Kachvāgarh, patron of Keçavadāsa¹⁰⁸ who composed VS 1648 Rasikapriyā and VS 1658 Kavipriyā, WILSON 1828^b: 112 = WILSON 1882: 371.

¹⁰² Not mentioned in the present data-set.

¹⁰³ See also Detige in this volume.

¹⁰⁴ A *samvigna-panḍita* can only be a wise monk of proper conduct: *samvigna* Skt., *samvigga* Pkt. *samvegī* H. - salvation seeking monk of correct conduct. See also TULSI 2009: 345: an ascetic who is not a *caityavāsīn*, but “used to follow the conduct propounded in the Āgamas.” MW 1115, 1 has for *sam-vigna* “agitated, flurried, terrified, shy MBh. Kāv. &c.” “moving to and fro BhP.” “(ifc.) fallen into.” Tripāṭhī 1975: 74 points to *samvijñā*. It is not clear in what sense he can be a patron other than by offering his knowledge.

¹⁰⁵ Klatt 2016: “**Vicārasaṭtriṅçikā** By Gajasāra, under Jinahaṅsa-sūri († VS 1582), begins: *bhuvāṇa-pāivam Vīram*, MITRA 1888: 19 no. 2909. [According to] WEBER 1891: 860 no. 1943 [the text] begins: *namiuṃ caü-vīsa jñe tas-sutta-viyāra-lesa-desāṇo*. Vicāra-chatrīsī, 2 leaves, BHANDARKAR 1887: 187^a no. 91, 93. Vicāra-shaṭtriṅçakā-tripāṭa, 3 leaves, ib. p. 221^a no. 24, 250^a no. 105. Avacūri, 4 leaves, 100 *çloka* written by Gajasāra, pupil of Dhavalacanda under Jinahaṅsa (VS 1555 - 82), begins: *namiuṃ caü-vīsa jñe*. Avacūri, begins: *çrī-Vāmeyaṃ mahimāmeyaṃ*, Vienna Ms. I 89, at the end also called Daṇḍakāvavacūri. VICĀRA-SHAṬTRIMÇIKĀ, by Gajasāra, with avacūrñi, written *nidhi-muni-çakendu 1579 samvat* in Pattana, Flor. G 46 B (38 verses). Vicārasaṭtriṅçikā, BENDALL 1886: 50^b no. 112.”

¹⁰⁶ Klatt 2016: “**Jinahaṅsasūri** The 59. *sūri* (other Mss.: 62. or 63. *sūri*) of the Vṛihat-kharatara-gaccha, between Jinasamudra-sūri and Jinamāñikya-sūri, son of *sāha*-Megharāja of the Copañā-gotra and Kamalādevī, born VS 1524, *gṛha-nāman* Dhanarāja, *dīkshā* VS 1535, *dīkshā-nāman* Dharmaraṅga, *pada-sthāpanā* at Ahmadāvād VS 1555 *jyeshṭha sudi 9 maharddhyā maṃ*° *Karmasīnha-kārīta-nandyāṃ çrī-Çāntisāgara-sūritah prāpta-sūri-padāh*, died VS 1582 at Pāṭaṇa, KLATT 1882: 249^b, WEBER 1891: 1050, 1051 line 1. Author of *Ācārāṅga-pradīpikā*, GOUGH 1878: 91 no. 154, MITRA 1888: 95 - 6, of *Sūtra-kṛitāṅga-dīpikā*, BHANDARKAR 1887: 279 no. 286. Under him VICĀRA-SHAṬ-TRINÇIKĀ was composed by Gajasāra, WEBER 1891: 860 verse 42 line 7 from below, Flor. G 46 B, folio 5^a verse 38. His pupil Puṇyasāgara composed VS 1645 a commentary on Jambū-dvīpa-prajñapti, MITRA 1886: 321 line 5. Inscription in a Jaina temple in Bahādūr-pur, north-east of Alwar (eastern Rājputānā), CUNNINGHAM 1885^a: 119 – 20: *Sam*° *1573 varshe āshāḍha badi 4 dine çrī-Bahudravya-pura (Bahādūr-pur) -çrī-Çrīmāla-saṃghenam ādi-nātha-caityaṃ kārītaṃ pratishṭhitaṃ çrī-Kha ... çrī-Jinahaṅsa-sūri-vijaya-rājye ācārya-çrī-Puṇyaratna-sūriti*.”

¹⁰⁷ Likely of the Śilāhāra dynasty of the Koṅkan ca. r. 1015-1022. See Altekar 1936, Schmiedchen 2014: 229.

¹⁰⁸ Bahadur 1972: xxv, 1976: 6.

UDAYAPRABHADEVASŪRI [Klatt p. 405] Of the Nāgendra-gaccha, pupil of Vijayasena-sūri, predecessor of Malliṣeṇa-sūri (Çaka 1214), see WEBER 1891: 940 verse 4, 942 verse 6. Patronised by Vastupāla *mantrīçvara* († VS 1298), see WEBER 1886: 306. Paṭṭāvalī: of the Nāgendra-munīndra-gaccha are Mahendraprabhu, Çānti-sūri (vanquisher of the Digambaras), Ānanda-sūri and Amaracandra-sūri (under Siddharāja VS 1150 – 99), Haribhadra (Kalikāla-Gautama), Vijayasena-sūri, Udayaprabhadēva-sūri, see PETERSON 1887^a: Appendix p. 17 – 9. In an inscription of [Mount] Abu VS 1287, WILSON 1828^c: 309, KĀTHAVATE 1883: Appendix p. 1 – 18. Composer of an inscription of Girnār, VS 1288 (*Nāgendra-gacche bhāṭṭāraka-çrī-Udayaprabha-sūri*), see BURGESS 1875^c: 24 verse 8, 29 line 4, 30 line 21 = BURGESS 1885: 286 verse 8 (translation ib. p. 288), 297 line 3 (translation ib. p. 298), 300 line 13 (translation ib. p. 302). He says a *çloka* in Siddharāja-prabandha, Merutuṅga's Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, RĀMACANDRA 1888: 171 line 4.

UDAYASIMHA [Klatt p. 417] *Ibhya*, son of Vasta, of the Vaṅṭhikā-gotra, Oça-vaṅça, his wife Amarāde, patron of a writer of a Ms. of Vyavahāra-sūtra, VS 1665 (*tatra 'ça-vaṅçābharaṇaṃ ca Vṛiddha-çākhīya udyad-guṇaratna-vārdhhiḥ | çrī-Vaṅṭhikā-gotraja ibhya-dhuryo Vastābhidhānas tu ... shū priyā 'sya |2|*). At the request of Dharmamūrti-sūri (VS 1602 – 70) he caused copies of the 45 āgamas to be made, see WEBER 1883^a: 225 no. 2, WEBER 1888: 638 no. 1877 verse 2 – 3 and 9 – 10.¹⁰⁹

KAKKASŪRI [Klatt p. 522] The 67. *sūri* of the Upakeça-gaccha, pupil of Siddha whose feast of installation was celebrated under the patronage of the *Sāh Sahaja* in the year VS 1371, he composed the work called Maccha-prabandha, in which the conduct (*caritra*) of Samara and Sahaja, the two sons of Deçala, is described, HOERNLE 1890^a: 241.¹¹⁰

KARṆASIMHA Minister to king Durgasiṅha of *çrī*-Nandapadra (?), son of Maṅgalabhūpāla. Under his patronage *Sāragrāha*-Karmavipāka has been compiled in 1384 A.D., see EGGELING 1891: 573 no. 1767.

KṢITIPĀLADEVA [Klatt p. 795] = Mahīpāla, VS 974,¹¹¹ patron of the poet Rājaçekhara,¹¹² KIELHORN 1889^j: 121.

GOVARDHANADHĀRIRĀJA Patron of *Kṛiṣṇa-paṇḍita* who composed *Kaṅsa-vadha*, WEBER 1886: 148 no. 1556.

CĀMUṆḌA Caulukya prince of Gujarāt, reigned 13 years, VS 1053 – 66, BHANDARKAR 1887: 10. 150, WEBER 1886: 210 verse 9. *Nṛipa* in Aṇahilla-pura at the time of Vīra-gaṇi (VS 938 – 91), PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XV: 105.

Cāmuṅḍa-rāya, patron of the Canarese poet Raṅga (born A.D. 949), see RICE 1883^b: 302, RICE 1884^a: XVI. King of Dakṣiṇa-Madurā, erected *çilā-çāsanas* 605 *kali-yuga* or 1215 after the death of Vardhamāna-*svāmi*, MACKENZIE 1873: 130^b, PĀTHAK 1885^c: 12^b. 13^a, ANONYMOUS 1875^a: 110 – 1 (extract from *Dvyāçraya*), FORBES 1856: 67.

¹⁰⁹ Klatt 2016: “Dharmamūrtisūri of the Añcala-gaccha.”

¹¹⁰ Klatt 2016: “Samara Son of Deçala in Pālhana-pura, carried out the 15. *uddhāra* [restoration] on Çatruṅjaya at the time of Siddha-sūri (VS 1330 – 71), HOERNLE 1890^a: 241 no. 66. On him Maccha-prabandha by Kakka-sūri (VS 1371 – 1409), ib. no. 67. VICĀRA-ÇREṆĪ [Poona Collection 1871/2 no. 378]: *tataḥ 1371 Yavanopadravaj Jāvaḍa-bimbe gate sā° Samarākena navyaṃ bimbaṃ sthāpitaṃ*. Samara amongst the meritorious *çrāvakas*, VRIHAD-GACCHA-GURVĀVALĪ, Ms. Samara-kathā, in Pushpa-māla-kathā, WEBER 1891: 1100 line 33.” See also Klatt 2016: “Siddhasūri.”

¹¹¹ Klatt 2016: “Mahīpāladeva [Klatt p. 3016] Inscription Çaka 836, BÜHLER 1883^a: 190. VS 974, FLEET 1887^b: 173 – 5. VS 993, BROADLEY 1872^a: 310.”

¹¹² Klatt 2016: “Rājaçekhara Author of 3 dramas, preceptor of the king Mahendra-pāla, author of Bhoja-prabandha, quoted in Somadeva's Yaças-tilaka, composed A.D. 959, PETERSON 1884: 45, 59 – 60. Author of Bāla-rāmāyaṇa, Bāla-bhārata or Pracaṇḍa-pāṇḍava, Karpūra-mañjarī and Viddha-çālā-bhañjikā, see Karpūra-mañjarī, edition DURGĀPRASĀD & PARAB 1887^b: Introduction p. 3, FLEET, The date of the poet Rāja-çekhara, FLEET 1887^a: 175 - 8.”

CŪḌĀMAṆINIGHAṆṬU A Tamil dictionary by Maṇḍalapuruṣa,¹¹³ a Jaina author of the 16. century, under the patronage of one of the kings of Vijaya-nagara, CALDWELL 1875: Introduction p. 130. See Maṇḍalapuruṣa.

JAYACCANDRA [Klatt p. 1137] Rāshtrakūṭa (Rāṭhor), of Kanauj, son of Vijayacandra, grandson of Govindacandra, acceded to the throne A.D. 1175 and was killed 1193, CUNNINGHAM 1880^b: 104, the last Rāṭhor *rājā*, ib. p. 128. Jayantacandra, patron of Harsha, who composed Naishadhīya, BÜHLER 1873^c: 36. Inscriptions of his father Vijayacandra, inscription VS 1225, CUNNINGHAM 1880^b: 117, 125, plate 37 no. 2. Inscription VS 1229: ib. p. 104, KIELHORN 1886^a: 6 – 13, cf. KIELHORN 1889^b: 13. Inscription VS 1232: ib. p. 131, calculated KIELHORN 1890^a: 30 no. 37. Inscription VS 1233. 1236: KIELHORN 1889^b: 136. 140, calculated KIELHORN 1890^a: 37 no. 65f. Inscription VS 1243: KIELHORN 1886^a: 12, CHANDRA 1841: 98 – 104, calculated KIELHORN 1890^a: 37 – 8 no. 69. Inscription VS 1241: FÜHRER 1889: 68.¹¹⁴

JAYANTĪPURĪ Here the king Kāmadeva (after VS 1050) [resided?], patron of Kavirāja who composed Rāghava-pāṇḍavīya, AUFRECHT 1859: 121^a no. 212.

JAYASIMHAKALPADRUMA [Klatt p. 1176] Compiled under the patronage of Jayasinha of Mathurā in A.D. 1713 by Ratnākara, son of paṇḍita *ṅrī*-Devabhāṭṭa of Benares, EGGELING 1891: 500a.¹¹⁵

ḌĀLACANDRA *Nṛipati*, in Benares, under him *ṅukla*-Mathurānātha composed *vedābhra-naga-bhū-gaṇye ṅake* (1704) (Aufrecht says 1778, but it is 1782 A.D.),¹¹⁶ AUFRECHT 1869: 60. *Rājā* Ḍālacanda-jī, on the title-page of Kalpa Sūtra, translated into *bhāshā* by Kavi Rāycand, under the patronage of Rājā Ḍālcand, printed and published for his great-grandson Rājā ṅivaprasād, Lakhnau 1875, [see RĀYCAND 1875].

DURGASIMHA King of *ṅrī*-Nandapadra (?), under the patronage of his minister Karṇasinha Sāragrāha-Karmavipāka has been composed¹¹⁷ in 1384 A.D., EGGELING 1891: 573 no. 1767.

DHARMA *Bhūpati*, in Gauḍa, patron of Vākpati (700 – 25 A.D.), BHANDARKAR 1887: 15, PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XI: verse 165, 222.

DHAVALACANDRA Patron of Nārāyaṇa who composed Hitopadeṅa, PETERSON 1887^b: 70 – 1.

PAMPA Canarese poet, born 902 A.D., his father Abhirāma-*deva-rāya* was a Brahman who became a Jaina, composed under the patronage of the Cālukya king Arikesarin Ādi-purāṇa (composed A.D. 941), and Pampa-bhārata or Vikramārjuna-vijaya (composed ṅaka 863), and Laghu-purāṇa, Pārṅvanātha-purāṇa, Paramāgama, RICE 1882^b: 19 – 23, RICE 1883^b: 299 – 300, RICE 1884^a: Introduction p. XIII – XIV.

MADANAPĀLA Composed VS 1431 Madana-vinoda, BHANDARKAR 1887: 47, 347, Corrections p. 1.¹¹⁸ Author of Smṛiti-kaumudī, BÜHLER 1872^b: 140. Quoted in Nāma-sāroddhāra, commentary on Hemacandra's Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi, AUFRECHT 1859: 185^b. Composed by Viṅveṅvarabhāṭṭa, son of Peṅṅibhāṭṭa and Ambikā, under the patronage of the ṅāka prince Madanapāla of Kāshṅhā (Kāṅha near Dillī), EGGELING 1891: 414^b.

¹¹³ Klatt 2016: “Maṇḍalapuruṣanighaṅṭa Jaina work, TAYLOR 1862: 82 - 3. Tamil lexicon by Maṇḍalapuruṣa (16. century, a Jaina Paṇḍit), WILSON 1828^a: 251.”

¹¹⁴ See also Jain 1957: .

¹¹⁵ On Ratnākara, see Śarmā 2004.

¹¹⁶ On this author see also http://www.perso-indica.net/work/sanskrit-persian_primer

¹¹⁷ According to Monier-Williams 1899: 1209.1 “composed by Kāmhadasūnu in 1384 A.D.”

¹¹⁸ The link between the different types of information is not clear.

MĀLHAṆADEVĪ¹¹⁹ Patron of the scribe Māloka VS 1445, PETERSON 1883: 62 line 19. 21.

RASIKAPRIYĀ Hindi, by Indrajī, 67 leaves, MANDLIK & MOOS 1882: 48 no. 126. Composed VS 1648 by Keçavadāsa, whose patron Indrajit was, WILSON 1828^b: 113 = WILSON 1882: 372.¹²⁰

VASTUPĀLA And Tejaḥpāla, ministers of Vīradhava († VS 1298) and Lavaṇaprasāda, DHRUVA 1882^b: 99. Their history in Merutuṅga's Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, PETERSON 1884: 88, KLATT 1882: 255^a no. 45. Vastupāla, a *mantrin* in whose house Vijayacandra was, Vastupāla honors Devendra-sūri, WEBER 1891: 1008 line 12, 17. VS 1288 *Luṇiga-vasahī Kasoṭī-bimba-sthāpanā Vastupālena Arbudācale sampādītā*. VS 1298 *Vastupāla-svargaḥ*, BHANDARKAR 1887: 14, 323. His genealogy of the Prāgvātānvaya: Caṇḍapa, Caṇḍaprasāda, Soma, Aṣvarāja, his son Malladeva, Vastupāla, Tejaḥpāla, ib. p. 21, 341 verse 53 – 4. Luṇiga, his eldest brother, died young, ib. p. 22. **Vastupāla**, minister of Vīradhava, king of Gurjara 1214 – 43 A.D., *mantriçvara* or *saṃgha-pati*, instituted Udayaprabhadeva-sūri of the Nāgendra-gaccha as *ācārya* and was his patron, WEBER 1886: 306 line 1 – 3, 307 line 7 – 9. The 15. sarga in Udayaprabha-sūri's Dharmābhayudaya-mahā-kāvya is called Vastupāla-tīrtha-yātrotsava-varṇana. The work is composed in honor of Vastupāla. His life in Someçvara's Kīrti-kaumudī, KĀTHAVATE 1883, WEBER 1886: 306 note 2. VS 1293 Vastupāla-Tejapāla-*pratiṣṭhā* on the Arbuda, KHARATARA-PAṬṬĀVALĪ, Collection 1873/4: no. 248, folio 2^a. Inscription VS 1287, WILSON 1828^c: 302 – 9. The Tapā-gaṇa honoured by Vastupāla, Munisundara's Gurvāvalī: verse 96, 195, [see edition ANONYMOUS 1905]. Images of Vastupāla's wives Lalitādevī and Sokhakā on the Gīrnār, BURGESS 1885: 312 no. 21, 22. 315 no. 34. Inscription VS 1287, KĀTHAVATE 1883: Appendix p. 19 – 24. His pilgrimage to Çatruṅjaya and Gīrnār, ib. p. 24 – 9. His pious buildings, ib. p. 29 – 36. Vastupāla-Tejaḥpālayor utpatti-yātrādi-prabandhaḥ, Merutuṅga's Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, RĀMACANDRA 1888: 251 – 69. Vastupāla-mantri-kathā, in Hemavijaya's (VS 1657) Kathā-ratnākara, WEBER 1891: 1106. Māṇikyā-sūri guru of Vastupāla, VS 1287 *prathama-yātrā*, VS 1296 *Arbudācale pratiṣṭhā*, VS 1296 *sita-shashthyāṃ çanau māghe divyaṃ yayau*, [VRHAD-GACCHA-GURVĀVALĪ], Collection 1873/4: no. 245, folio 20, 22. His life in Rājaçekhara's Prabandha-koça, BÜHLER 1873^c: 31.

ŚRĪJINENDRACARITRAM [Klatt p. 1323] Or Padmānanda-kāvyaṃ, by Amaracandra¹²¹ (about VS 1276 – 97), pupil of Jinadatta-sūri of the Vāyaḍa-gaccha, begins: *arhaṃ naumi*, palm-leaf Ms., written VS 1297, 418 leaves, PETERSON 1883: 58 – 9 no. 8, Appendix p. 2 – 3 no. 3. 256 leaves, 8000 *çloka*, ib. p. 126 no. 285 = BHANDARKAR 1888: 326 no. 285. 20 leaves, BHANDARKAR 1887: 183^a no. 26. Composed at the request of a patron of Kaushṭhāgārika Padma, see BÜHLER 1889^c: 5 line 15, 38 line 2 – 1 from below.

SIDDHASŪRI [4] The 66. *sūri*, VS 1330 – 71, the feast of his installation was celebrated by *sāh Deçala* in Pālhaṇa-pura. Under the patronage of Samara he set up the image of Ādinātha, of the time of the 6. *uddhāra* [restoration],¹²² on the Çatruṅjaya, HOERNLE 1890^a: 241. His pupil was *vācaka* Rājahaṅsa (VS 1444), NANDARGIKAR 1885: Preface p. I line 3 from below.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Candella queen (Dikshit 1977: 144).

¹²⁰ See Indrajit above. Klatt 2016: “**Keçavadāsa** [Klatt p. 761] Composed VS 1658 Kavipriyā (Hindi), WILSON 1828^b: 111 – 3, and Rāmacandrikā, ib. p. 113.”

¹²¹ Klatt 2016: “**Amaracandra** [Klatt p. 214] Or Amarapaṇḍita, Amarayati, pupil of Jinadatta-sūri, of the Vāyaḍa-gaccha, contemporary of Arisiṅha (about VS 1276 – 97). His biography is found in the thirteenth chapter of Rājaçekhara's Prabandha-koça, BÜHLER 1889^c: 4 – 7. 37 – 8, BHANDARKAR 1887: 6. [His works are:] Alamkāra-prabodha, Kalākalāpa, Kāvya-kalpalatā or Kaviçikshā, Kāvya-kalpalatā-parimala or Kāvya-kalpalatā-mañjarī, Chando-ratnāvalī, Padmānanda-mahākāvya or Jinendra-caritra (palm-leaf Ms. VS 1297), Bāla-bhārata (a part of it: Draupadī-svayaṃvara), Sūkta-ratnāvalī, Syādi-çabda-samuccaya.” Cf. Shalom 2017: 70.

¹²² Different information given in Fn. 90.

¹²³ On Samarasiṃha or Sāh Samara, see K. C. Jain Historical Jainism Ch. VI .50, p. 60/92

SIDDHEŚA [Klatt p. 4631 and 4654] VS 1150 – 99 [Klatt p. 4654: 1150 – 1200], patron of **Vīra-sūri** of the Khaṇḍilla-gaccha, colophon of Bhāvadeva's PĀRÇVANĀTHA-CARITRA, verse 9 – 10, Vienna Ms. I 252, folio 139^b.¹²⁴

SUKṚTASAMKĪRTANA By Arisīṅha (VS 1300), quoted in Arisīṅha's Kāvya-kalpa-latā, BHANDARKAR 1887: 6, 312 – 3. 13 leaves, Ms. VS 1510, KIELHORN 1881^a: 79. 45 leaves, BÜHLER 1888^a: 551. 29 leaves, KIELHORN 1881^d: 17 no. 415 = KIELHORN 1882: 8 no. 415 = BHANDARKAR 1888: 148 no. 415. 12 leaves, BHANDARKAR 1887: 194^a no. 51. **Arisīṅha** composed Sukṛta-samkīrtana in honour of his patron **Vastupāla** († VS 1298), BÜHLER 1889^c: 1. Arisīṅha, son of Lavaṇasīṅha or Lāvanyasīṅha, composed [Sukṛta-samkīrtana] about VS 1285, ib. p. 8.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ Synonym of Jayasīṃhadeva, called "Siddha-rāja." Vīra-sūri is not mentioned in the main entry on Jayasīṃhadeva. See Klatt 2016:

"**Jagaddeva** Paramāra prince of Dhārā who prior to his succession to the throne served Siddha-rāja of Aṇahila-pura (VS 1150 – 99)."

"**Jayasīṃhadeva** [Klatt p. 1170] Siddha-rāja, VS 1150 – 99, son of Karṇa, king of Gujarat, died VS 1199 *kārttika sudi* 3, BÜHLER 1889^d: 221, BHANDARKAR 1887: 11. 150. 316 – 8. 457, FORBES 1856: 108 – 79, Merutuṅga's Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, RĀMACANDRA 1888: 129 – 90.

The dispute of Deva-sūri [with the Digambara Kumudacandra took place] VS 1181 under Jayasīṃhadeva's reign, KLATT 1882: 254^a note 54, WEBER 1891: 1006 note 4. *Çrī-Dharmaghosha-prabhavā babhūvuḥ | yat-pāda-padme kalahansa-līlāṃ dadhau nṛipaḥ çrī-Jayasīṃha-devaḥ*, PETERSON 1883: 61, Appendix p. 8 verse 2. At his time in Aṇahilapāṭaka Hemacandra wrote VS 1164 Jīvasamāsa-vṛitti, ib. p. 64 line 2, Appendix p. 18 line 3 from below. Jayamaṅgala composed Kavi-çikshā under him, ib. p. 68, Appendix p. 80 line 4. Under his reign Yaçodeva of the Ūkeça-gaccha composed VS 1174 in Aṇahilapāṭaka a commentary on Navatattva, PETERSON 1887^a: Appendix p. 284 verse 10.

Converted by Hemacandra-sūri, pupil of Abhayadeva-sūri, of the Harshapurīya-gaccha, ib. p. 28, Appendix p. 274 verse 9, p. 133 verse 3. Jayasīṃhadeva gave to Ānanda-sūri and Amaracandra-sūri of the Nāgendra-gaccha the names *vyāghra-çiçu* and *siṅha-çiçu*, ib. Appendix p. 18 verse 4. He honoured Dharmaghosha-sūri of the Pūrṇimā-gaccha, ib. p. 39 line 6, Appendix p. 95 verse 5. Under his reign a Ms. of Ākhyānaka-maṇi-koça was written VS 1190 in Dhavalaka-pura, ib. Appendix p. 82 verse 32. [Under his reign] Yaçodeva composed VS 1180 in Aṇahilapāṭaka a commentary on Pākshika-sūtra, ib. Appendix p. 129 verse 8. [Under his reign] Hemacandra composed VS 1175 a commentary on Jinabhadrā's Viçeshāvayāka-bhāshya, WEBER 1888: 787 line 5, WEBER 1886: 221 no. 1659 verse 2, PETERSON 1887^a: Appendix p. 167 line 14.

Date VS 1169 in Merutuṅga's Laghu-çata-padī, BHANDARKAR 1887: 5 line 5 – 4 from below. VS 1198 *Jayasīṃha-kārita-Rudramālaya-(mahālaya-)tatpradhānāliya*^o, ib. p. 323 line 1. He was astonished by the reclusiveness of Jayasīṃha-sūri of the Āñcala-gaccha, ib. p. 130, 442 verse 2, Merutuṅga Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, RĀMACANDRA 1888: Preface p. 12. With the surname Çrī-kalaça, under him lived Vāghbhaṭa, BHANDARKAR 1887: 155 line 3 from below.

Under him a Ms. of Pañca-vastu was written VS 1179, KIELHORN 1881^a: 25 no. 41. His conference with Madanavarman, MITRA 1886: 35 line 12 – 10 from below. Inscription VS 1196 and 1202 (after his death), DHURVA 1881: 158f., BÜHLER 1887^a: 245, KĀTHAVATE 1883: Introduction p. XII, AUFRECHT 1859: 180^b. Under him Ādinātha-caritra was composed VS 1160 by Vardhamāna-sūri, see colophon verse 9, quoted in Samayasundara's SĀMĀCĀRI-ÇATAKA (VS 1672), folio 26^b. Converted by *vādi*-Deva Jayasīṃhadeva erected VS 1183 in Pattana a *Ṛishabha-prāsāda*, quoted from Upadeça-taraṅgiṇī, Ms. of Jayavijaya's TAPĀ-GACCHA-PATṬĀVALI, folio 5^b, [sic]. At the end of Hemacandra's grammar, PETERSON 1887^a: Appendix p. 116, WEBER 1886: 118 line 2. 211, PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA, çriṅga 20 – 22, in the biographies of Vīra, Deva, and Hemacandra.

Sadharājesangh, athavā Siddharāj Jayasīṃhadevanī vārttā, Gujarati, Ahmedabad 1882, 152 pages, CATALOGUE BOMBAY 1882 II: 30."

"**Vijayasīṃhasūri** Of the Khaṇḍilla-gaccha, pupil of Bhāvadeva-sūri, his successor Vīra-sūri, friend of Siddharāja (VS 1150 – 99), PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XX: verse 6. Vijayasīṃha-sūri, about VS 1150, Khaṇḍilla-gaccha, pupil of Bhāvadeva, colophon of Bhāvadeva's PĀRÇVANĀTHA-CARITRA, verse 7, Vienna Ms. I 252, folio 139^b. His pupil Vīra-sūri was a friend of Siddheça, PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XX: verse 9, 10."

Vijayasīṃhasūri Candra-gacchīyācārya, composed VS 1183 a cūrṇi on Çrāddha-pratikramaṇa-sūtra, WEBER 1891: 889 line 14. Quoted in Vicārāṃṛita-saṃgraha (VS 1443), ib. p. 923 line 16, 925 line 13 – 4. A poet Vijayasīṃha quoted in Someçvara's (VS 1288 – 1311) Kīrti-kaumudī, KĀTHAVATE 1883: XI. His successor Padmadeva-sūri, for his pupil a Ms. of Kalpa-sūtra was written VS 1247 in Bhṛigukaccha, PETERSON 1887^a: Appendix p. 51 no. 225. Pupil of Hema-sūri, converted Siddharāja (VS 1150 – 99), preceptor of Candra-sūri, ib. p. 405 no. 614 [sic], [see PETERSON 1887^a: Appendix p. 133]."

"**Vīrasūri** [Klatt p. 3935, cf. Vīrasūri, Klatt p. 3938] Or Vīrācārya, of the Khaṇḍilla-gaccha, pupil of Vijayasīṃha-sūri, friend of Siddha-rāja (VS 1150 – 99), Govindācārya was his *kalā-guru*, PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XX: 93. [...]

Vīrasūri [Klatt p. 3938] Successor of Vijayasīṃha-sūri, pupil of Bhāvadeva-sūri of the Khaṇḍilla-gaccha, friend of Siddha-rāja (VS 1150 – 99), PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XV: verse X [sic; cf. Vīrasūri, Klatt p. 3935]. Colophon verse 5 – 9 of Bhāvadeva's PĀRÇVANĀTHA-CARITRA, Vienna Ms. I 252, folio 139^b. *Pati-Siddheça-mahita*, ib. verse 10."

See also Munshi 1944: 184.

¹²⁵ Klatt 2016: "**Arisīṅha** [Klatt p. 237] Son of Lavaṇasīṅha (Lāvanyasīṅha), author of Kavitarāhasya, Kāvyaakalpatā (completed by Amaracandra), and Sukṛta-samkīrtana, the last composed about VS 1285, see BHANDARKAR 1887: 6, 312, BÜHLER 1889^c: 4, 8 [= Bühler 1889]."

HARṢADEVA [Klatt p. 5018] Author of the drama *Ratnāvalī*. A verse from it quoted by Dāmodaragupta (800 A.D.), PETERSON 1886: 138. *Ratnāvalī* of Ṣṛīharshadeva, edited by GODABOLE & PARAB 1890, 8 Annas, Preface: composed by the king Harsha of Kaṣṁīr who reigned 1113 – 25 A.D. But Böhler: 1089 – 1101 A.D., BÜHLER 1877^a: 22, BÜHLER 1873^b: 127 – 8. Hall held the opinion that Bāṇa is the author. A verse of the *Ratnāvalī* is agreeing with Bāṇa's Harsha-carita. Böhler quotes a passage of the VS 1711 composed Bhāva-bodhinī, commentary on *Mayūra-ṣatakā* by Madhusūdana (son of Mādhava-bhaṭṭa, pupil of Bāla-kṛishṇa), in which Ṣṛī-harsha, patron of Bāṇa and *Mayūra*,¹²⁶ is named as author of *Ratnāvalī*, [BÜHLER 1873^b: 127 – 8].

HARṢAVARDHANA [Klatt p. 5029, an abridged version p. 5140] The era begins 607 A.D. (fixed by Cunningham), patron of Bāṇa and Hiuen Tsiang, PAṆḌIT 1887: CCXX. Inscription ṣṛī-Harsha-saṁvat 25 = 631/2 A.D., BÜHLER 1888^c: 268 – 9. Harsha, patron of Bāṇa in Vāṇarasi in the time of Mānātuṅga, PRABHĀVAKA-CARITRA XII: verse 49. Harshavardhana, king of Sthāneṣvara (Ṭhāneṣvar) in northern India, Panjāb, reigned according to REINAUD 607 – 48 A.D., FÜHRER 1885^a: 201 – 43. *Uttarā-pathādhipati-ṣṛī*-Harsha vanquished by Pulakeṣi II Cālukya, Ṣaka 532. 561, BHANDARKAR 1879: 16 – 28, ib. p. 17, 25 following genealogy: Jayasiṅha (428), Raṇa-rāya (448), Pulakeṣi I (468), Kīrtivarman (Ṣaka 488 – 512), Maṅgalīṣa (Ṣaka 512 – 32), Pulakeṣi II, Kīrtivarman's son, began to reign Ṣaka 532, was on the throne Ṣaka 556, Ravikīrti's inscription, was seen by Hwan Tsang (638 – 9 A.D.), Vikramāditya II was on the throne Ṣaka 656, reigned till Ṣaka 669, Kīrtivarman II, inscription Ṣaka 680, 11 years reign, FLEET 1879^a: 23, WARREN 1883.

Son of Prabhākara-varadhana and Yaṣovati in Sthāneṣvara in Panjāb, later in Kānyakubja, other name Ṣīlāditya, PAṆḌIT 1887: CVII – CXXXV. Ṣṛī-harsha-Harsha-varadhana, king of Ṭhāṇesar and Kanauj, reigned 606 – 48 A.D. on a greater part of the northern and western India, BÜHLER 1888^b: 186^a.

Demonstration that Harsha reigned in Nepal and introduced there his era, INDRAJĪ 1884^a: 421, BÜHLER 1890^c: 40 – 1, from a passage in Bāṇa's Ṣṛī-harsha-carita. The Madhuban copper-plate of Harsha, dated *saṁvat* 25 = 631/2 A.D., BÜHLER 1889^k: 67 – 75.

His genealogy, ib. p. 68: Naravardhana, Rājyavardhana I, Ādityavardhana, Prabhākaravardhana, married with Yaṣomatī-devī, sons Rājyavardhana II and Harsha. Hiuen Tsiang and Bāṇa name him Pushya-bhūti, a *nakshatra* name, to whom *pushya* may give hail, ib. p. 70 – 1: Rājyavardhana II was a Saugata according to the inscription. The inscription demonstrates that Harsha was himself a poet, ib. p. 71. At the execution of the inscription participated *mahā-sāmanta-mahā-rāja*-Skandagupta and *sāmanta-mahā-rāja*-Īṣvaragupta, ib. p. 72.

Author of *Adhyātma-bindu*, Ms. VS 1770, KIELHORN 1881^a: 91, and *Liṅgānuṣāsana* with commentary by Ṣabara-svāmin, identical with the king of Kānyakubja (1. half of the 7. century), ZACHARIAE 1889: 999. FRANKE 1890: 37 – 40 on Harsha's *Liṅgānuṣāsana*.¹²⁷

HINDŪPATI [Klatt p. 5053, a duplicate p. 5119] Genealogy: Campati-rāya, Chatra-ṣāla, Hṛidaya-sāha, Sabhā-siṅha. Hindūpati of the Bundela-vaṅṣa, patron of Maithila Durgādatta, author of *Vṛtta-muktāvalī*, EGGELING 1889^a: 312.

HERAMBAPĀLA [Klatt p. 5172] King, his son Devapāla (VS 1011), KIELHORN 1889ⁱ: 122 – 35. Other name of Mahīpāla, patron of the poet Rājaṣekhara (VS 974), BÜHLER 1886^a: 242^a.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Klatt 2016: “**Sūryaṣataka** [...] SŪRYA-ṢATAKA, by Mayūra, with ūkā by Tribhuvana-pāla, begins: *abhinavā n[ū]tanā*, in *Kāvya-mālā* 19 (1889), 51 pages, [see NĀRĀYAṆA RĀMA 1954]. Mayūra was brother-in-law of Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa and lived in Ujjayinī at the court of Vṛiddhabhoja.”

¹²⁷ According to Thapar 2013: 492f., Harṣa was associated both “with Buddhism and Śivism”: “Xuangzang [...] is consistent in projecting Harṣa as a patron of Buddhism as are the inscriptions in giving him a Śaiva identity.” In the synoptic table, his religious affiliation is given in brackets as “Hindu,” in view of the “inherited” religion of his family.

¹²⁸ Klatt 2016: “**Devapāla** Son of Herambapāla (or Mahīpāla), VS 1005. 1011, CUNNINGHAM 1880a: 95, KIELHORN 1889^k: 162 - 79.”

Interestingly enough, Klatt (1892/2016) does not incorporate all the information on “patronage” furnished by the index of the catalogue of Jaina manuscripts of his teacher A. Weber (1891), despite the fact that in all cases of overlap, Klatt’s entries offer supplementary information. The case in point are the following six individuals identified by Weber as “patrons,” but not by Klatt, although their names appear in the Jaina-Onomasticon: (1) the monk Padmacandra, patron of the monk Candrakīrti, (2) the monk Paramānanda, patron of the monk Vināyaka (whose work Śraddhakalpalatā is not listed in the Jaina-Onomasticon), (3) Lūṅiga, patron of Caṇḍapāla, (4) Sūryavatī (°matī), patron of Somadeva (both statuses unclear), (5) Harihara patron of Sāyaṇa, (6) Hema, patron of the monk Somatilaka. What are the reasons for this discrepancy?

Klatt (2016: 738) probably did not include Lūṅiga, because none of the available dates of the individuals designated in this way matched those of the householder Caṇḍapāla (p. 358). Though two Harihara’s are included in the Jaina-Onomasticon and one Sāyaṇa, their relationship is not recorded. Harṣadeva and several Somadevas are included, but no patronage relationship is recorded. In contrast to Somadeva, Sūryavatī is entirely missing in his compilation. This fact alone indicates that, before he became irreversibly ill, Klatt had not been able to incorporate all of the data of Weber’s catalogue, parts of which he had proof-read. Yet, he may also have adopted a different, more careful approach than Weber, who predominantly marks “preceptor-disciple” relationships as forms of “patronage.” Klatt does the same in only one instance, as the table shows.

The most thought-provoking case is Hema, the son of Rayaṇa (Ratna-gaṇi), who, according to the original text reproduced in Weber’s catalogue, was a *saṃghapati* who had become a monk, as his title “*gaṇi*” indicates. Likely, because the matter is not entirely clear, Klatt does not label the relationship between Hema and Somatilaka-sūri as “patronage” or otherwise in his entry on “Hema.” He only mentions that “at his [Hema’s] request Somatilaka-sūri wrote VS 1387 a Ms. of Sattari-saya-ṭhāṇaṃ, WEBER 1891: 840 - 1 no. 1932.” Weber, by contrast, interprets the term “request” in the original text as evidence for the existence of a “patronage” relationship. Klatt refers to the primary source on p. 840 in Weber’s (1891) catalogue, while Weber in his own index, for once, wrongly refers to p. 1214. Klatt’s (2016: 921) own work helps identifying Somatilaka as an *ācārya* and leader of the order (“*sūri*”). Yet, more information from other sources is needed to establish whether Hema was a householder or a monk at the time. If he was a householder, then what does the expression “to request” signify in this context? Certainly, a “request” or “entreaty,” directed at a leading monk to compose a particular (kind of) text, cannot be interpreted as a form of “protection or support” (patronage). In refraining from labelling uncertain relationships such as this as “patronage,” Klatt show greater restraint than A. Weber, who seemed to over-interpret the tenuous available evidence.

The discrepancy between Weber’s and Klatt’s treatment of Hema’s relationship to Somatilake illustrates how difficult it is in a specific case, without further contextual information, to infer the quality of a particular relationship on the basis of only one or two words in the original document. The problem is compounded by the reliance of secondary sources such as a catalogue, even assuming that all existing information in primary sources has been accurately translated and processed. The prosopographer has three possibilities: (a) to reproduce the original wording, (b) to subsume it under a code based on his/her own interpretation of the evidence, (c) both to preserve the original terms and to add a coding system. A minimum requirement is that, in difficult cases, the criteria of subjective interpretation involved in (b) and (c) are laid bare for readers to assess themselves.

Even if some kind of relationship of protection and support can be verified in the text, with good reasons, it is not always entirely clear what exactly a “patron” contributed, especially a monastic patron or a king. Did they just offer blessings or general protection or also material support? In the case of Abhayodayagaṇi “*Samvignapāṇḍita*,” patron of Gajasāra-gaṇi it is unambiguously clear that one monk acted as “patron” of another. There was certainly an asymmetrical relationship of kinds. But what kind of “patronage” was extended is unclear. Without further information, which a cumulative database may be able to supply at some stage, one can only speculate whether it (a) was a relationship of general support (“blessing” = permission to do the work), (b) or material support. Certainly, the first option seems more likely in a Jaina monastic context.

Ideally, a prosopography of “patronage” relationships should be able to distinguish between spiritual protectors (*niśraya-dātṛ*), worldly guardians (*saṃrakṣaka*) and material sponsors (*prayojaka*). Klatt’s data are often silent about the precise status and actions of named protectors and sponsors. Are the named householders kings, ministers or merchants? In many, but not all, cases additional exploration of cross-references in the Jaina-Onomasticon¹²⁹ and other sources¹³⁰ can eliminate ambiguity, as much as possible. A prosopographical database clearly helps in this regard. What is the religious status and affiliation of the main agents? Are they monks or laity? Jain or Hindu? Frequently, personal names hold a clue. Designations of monastic positions such as °*sūri*, °*gaṇi*, etc., unequivocally point to a Jaina mendicant status. Yet, rarely can the denomination and sub-sect affiliation of a mendicant be inferred from the name alone with a high degree of accuracy.¹³¹ Yet, again, information on sect-affiliation can often be discerned through cross-references. Sponsored literary works that exclusively deal with subjects connected with Hinduism point to affiliation of patron and client with the latter, while works dealing with topics related to Jainism are also sometimes sponsored by Hindu kings or councillors. These and other problems resulting from incomplete information can be successfully addressed with the help of a database.

The synoptic table below indicates how prosopographical information extracted from a complex text sample such as the above can be reassembled in new ways to yield insight into relationships that are not immediately visible. It demonstrates, in principle, how a sufficiently large database can link information from different sources which are supplementary. The table is merely indicative. It does not include columns for inspirer, beneficiary,¹³² *jāti*,¹³³ *gotra*,¹³⁴ location of the “client,” and other related information given in the extract from Klatt 2016 reproduced above. With the already mentioned three exceptions, where patronage relationships were inferred, the table represents only relationships which are explicitly labelled as “patronage” by Klatt. Square brackets indicate inferred (from titles and names etc.) or supplementary information from other sources indicated in the footnotes above. The sums exclude overlapping information.¹³⁵ The information is rearranged under the alphabetically listed names of the patrons. In a database, the same information can be reshuffled in whichever way desired to explore large datasets.

¹²⁹ Some are reproduced here in footnotes.

¹³⁰ Many names can be identified via Google.

¹³¹ On Jaina names, see Flügel 2018a.

¹³² One case: Dharmamūrti-sūri (patron: Vastupāla).

¹³³ Two cases: Vastupāla, Udayasiṃha.

¹³⁴ One case: Udayasiṃha.

¹³⁵ Under “patron,” Haṛṣa is listed three times, and Ḍālacandra and Vastupāla two times.

	PATRON	Status	Dynasty	Location	Religion	CLIENT	Status	Religion	Sect	OBJECT / EVENT
1	Abhayodaya-gaṇi	Monk			[Jaina]	Gaṇasāra-gaṇi	[Monk-Poet]	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Brihat-Kharatara-gaccha	Vicārasatṭrimśikā
2	Arikesarin	King	Śilāhāra-Cālukya		[Hindu]	Pampa	Poet	[Jaina]	[Digambara]	Ādipurāṇa Pampabhārata = Vikramārjunavijaya
3	Arjuna(varma)deva	King	Paramāra	Mālava	[Hindu]	Chāhaḍa (Bāhala)	[Poet]	[Jaina]		
4	Cāmuṇḍa-rāya	Prince ¹³⁶		Madurā	[Jaina]	Ranna	Poet	[Digambara]		
5	Ḍālacandra	King		Benares	[Hindu]	Śukla Mathurānātha	Poet	[Hindu]		
6	Ḍālacandra	King		Benares	[Hindu]	Rāyacandra	Poet	[Hindu]		
7	Dharma	King		Gauḍa	[Hindu]	Vākapaṭi	Poet	[Hindu]		
8	Dhavalacandra	[King] ¹³⁷		[Bengal]	N/A	Nārāyaṇa	Poet	[Hindu]		Hitopadeśa
9	Govardhanadhāri-rāja	King			[Hindu]	Kṛṣṇa-panḍita	Poet	[Hindu]		Kaṇsa-vadha
10	Harṣa “Puṣyabhūti”	King		Kaśmīr	[Hindu]	Bāna	[Poet]			
11	Harṣa “Puṣyabhūti”	King		Kaśmīr	[Hindu]	Mayūra	[Poet]			
12	Harṣa “Puṣyabhūti”	King		Sthāneśvara	[Hindu]	Hiuen Tsiang	[Poet]	[Bauddha]		
13	Hindūpati	King	Bundela	Mithila	Hindu	Maithila Durgādatta	[Poet]	[Hindu]		Vṛtta-muktāvalī
14	Indrajit Rāmasāhi	Prince		Kachvāgarh	[Hindu]	Keśavadāsa	Poet	[Hindu]		Rāsikpriyā Kavipriyā
15	Jayantacandra	King	Rāṣṭrakūṭa	Kanauj	[Hindu]	Harṣa	Poet	[Hindu]		Naiśadhīya
16	Jayasimha	[King]		Mathurā	[Hindu]	Ratnākara	Compiler	[Hindu]		Jayasimhakaḷpadruma
17	Kāmadeva	King		Jayantipurī	[Hindu]	Kavirāja	Poet	[Hindu]		Rāghava-pāṇḍaviya
18	Karṇasimha	Minister		Nandapadra?	[Hindu]	[Kāmhadasūnu] ¹³⁸	Poet / Compiler	[Hindu]		Sāragrāha-Karmavipāka
19	Kṣitipāladeva =Herambapāla =Mahīpāla	King	Gurjara-Pratihāra		[Hindu]	Rājaśekhara	Poet	[Hindu]		
20	Madanapāla	King	Ṭāka	Kāṣṭhā (Kāṭha)	[Hindu]	Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa	Poet	[Hindu]		
21	Mālhaṇadevī	[Queen]	Candella		[Hindu]	Māloka	Scribe			
22	N/A	Householder		Kauṣṭhā	N/A	Amaracandra[-sūri] ¹³⁹	Monk-Poet	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Vāyāḍa-gaccha	Jinendra-caritra
23	N/A	King	Vijayanagara	Vijayanagara	[Hindu]	Maṇḍalapuruṣa	Paṇḍit	Jaina ¹⁴⁰		Cūḍāmaṇinighaṇṭu
24	Sāh Deśala	Merchant		Pālhaṇa-pura	[Jaina]	Siddha-sūri	Monk	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Upakeśa-gaccha	Installation feast
25	Sāh Sahaja	Merchant			[Jaina]	Siddha[-sūri]	Monk	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Upakeśa-gaccha	Installation feast
26	[Sāh] Samara	Merchant		Śatruñjaya	[Jaina]	Siddha-sūri	Monk	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Upakeśa-gaccha	Ādinātha image

¹³⁶ Probably: Minister. Klatt merges information from different sources which may not refer to the same person.

¹³⁷ See forewords and introductions of the editions of the text.

¹³⁸ Monier-Williams 1899: 1209.1.

¹³⁹ Indirect patronage via the recipient of direct patronage, the householder Padma of Kauṣṭhā. This was probably because monks are not allowed to work for householders.

¹⁴⁰ Almost certainly Digambara, since his works mentioned by Klatt are written in Tamil language. See infra.

27	Siddheśa [-rāja] [=Jayasiṃha]	King	[Cālukya]	[Gujarat]	[Jaina] ¹⁴¹	Vīra-sūri	Monk	Mūrtipūjaka	Khaṇḍilla-gaccha	
28	Udayasiṃha	Merchant			[Jaina] ¹⁴²	N/A	Scribe	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Añcala-gaccha	Vyavahāra-sūtra
29	Vastupāla	Minster		Gurjara	[Jaina]	Udayaprabhadeva-sūri	Monk-Poet	[Mūrtipūjaka]	Nāgendra-gaccha	Installation [feast] Gīrnār-Inscription
30	Vastupāla	[Minister]			[Jaina]	Arisiṃha	Poet	[Mūrtipūjaka]		Sukṛta-samkīrtana
	King	15	Hindu	16		Poet	19	Hindu	13	
	Prince	2	Jaina	9		Monk-Poet	3	Jaina	3	
	Queen	1	N/A	2		Compiler	1	Digambara	1	
	Minister	3				Monk	4	Mūrtipūjaka	9	
	Merchant	4				Paṇḍit	1	Buddhist	1	
	Monk	1				Scribe	2			

¹⁴¹ “Converted” by Ācārya Hemacandra (Klatt 2016: 397).

¹⁴² Almost certainly “Jaina” given the caste affiliation, the Jaina work sponsored, and the Jaina *ācārya* requesting it.

If the information furnished in brackets in the table based on cross-referencing and inferences is correct, then the most interesting result of the prosopography of this small, non-representative sample is that most “patrons” recorded by Klatt were Hindu kings, supporting Hindu and Jaina poets or poet-monks. This statistical fact, of course, tells us more about Klatt’s selection of available sources, than the actual historical distribution of relationships across regions and periods. The main findings, as far as the Jaina communities are concerned, can be summarised in the form of eight statements:

1. The chiefly manuscript-based data collated by Klatt on the basis of secondary sources in the mid-second half of the 19th century suggests that “patronage” of Jaina text-production (and of other activities) was mainly extended by members of the royal court: both by members of the royal household, especially by Kings, and by Jaina ministers.
2. No case of community patronage is explicitly recorded.
3. Jaina activities were patronised in the main by individual Jaina ministers, and sometimes by (Jaina) merchants.
4. Jainas only sponsored Jaina activities. Predominantly Jaina monastic poets, and scribes, copying Jaina texts, were patronised.
5. Kings and local rulers supported mostly Hindu poets, but also Jaina poets, who occasionally also composed texts of a non-Jaina nature.
6. Though the evidence is not entirely clear, it seems that Jaina monks mainly received material support indirectly, in the form of sponsorship of religious projects which they inspired, inauguration ceremonies, and the like. It remains unclear, however, what exactly “patronage” of the literary activities of monk-poets means. Likely, it implied offering accommodation, and help with procuring textual sources and scribes.
7. Only one case of a monk offering support to another monk is recorded, without detailing the kind of support.¹⁴³
8. Only one female patron, a queen, is on record in this particular slice of data.

The table shows that in Klatt’s own, rather limited, sample of data pertaining to “patronage” three principal types of “patrons” can be identified: (a) mostly (Hindu) kings, and other members of royal households, and of the court, (b) (Jaina) householders, and (c) one (Jaina) mendicant. Five principle types of recipients can be identified: (a) mostly (Hindu) poets, (b) (Jaina) mendicants, (c) scribes, (d) one compiler, and (e) one paṇḍit. Interestingly, most cases of “patronage” in the Jaina-Onomasticon designate “patron-client relations” between Hindu kings and poets. Evidence of patronage by and of Jainas is less frequent. Unsurprisingly, most Jaina “clients” received support from Jaina “patrons.”

The evidence seems to contradict the overall impression gained by recent surveys of epigraphical evidence, such as Thapar’s (1987, 1992) or Owen’s (2010), that, in certain periods of South Asian history, the main sponsors of religion were not kings, but worshippers from the Buddhist and Jaina communities.¹⁴⁴ On the other hand, the data seems to broadly support Pollock’s (2006: 513) findings on the significance of court patronage in the literary and epigraphic texts.

Yet, no firm conclusions can be drawn from these few cases assembled by Klatt, and here selected for prosopographical analysis through keyword search. Firstly, they cover only part of the relevant data compiled by Klatt. Secondly, the meaning of most expressions that could be interpreted as designations of some form of “patronage” is ambiguous, and has to be inferred in most cases (e.g. the question in what sense one monk can

¹⁴³ Cf. *supra* Laughlin 2003a.

¹⁴⁴ Thapar’s observations are echoed by Owen’s 2010 on Jaina inscriptions at Śravaṇabāḷagoḷa and Ellora: “Moreover, early medieval donative inscriptions in Karnataka indicate that the vast majority of patrons were local rulers or administrators, some with martial affiliations. Although many of the patrons appear to have been high officials of the state, like Cāmundarāya, they typically acted independently of kings in their commissions” (p. 212). “When we take a closer look at the art historical evidence at Ellora, we start to see a very different picture of patronage than what is typically presented in the scholarship on the site. The caves at Ellora seem to have been sustained and expanded not by Rāstrakūta kings, but primarily through the efforts of those who worshipped there” (p. 225).

act as “patron” of another). The religious orientation of recipients and patrons, roles, and other social indicators, is also not immediately apparent and require further research, following first of all the leads offered by Klatt’s work. Most importantly, Klatt’s evidence as a whole is not representative. More reliable results can be expected from a comprehensive prosopographical database, which of course may also not be representative (the validity of samples of historical data such as these can only ever be estimated on the basis of indicative case studies).

Overall, the analysis shows that the prosopographical method of extraction and coding information as such is promising. But more, and better, data and conceptual tools are required to study “patronage” on the basis of manuscript data from secondary sources alone. Part of the problem is that information on Jaina “patronage” relationships are rarely recorded in manuscript catalogues, and in manuscripts. These were Klatt’s main sources, because Jaina epigraphic catalogues, providing access to the contents of Jaina donative inscriptions, were in the main published after he was forced to stop working in 1892.

Conclusions

The main conclusion that can be drawn from this brief survey of methodological questions concerning the operationalisation of the concept of “patronage” in South Asian Studies is that a clearer analytical distinction between “religious,” “political,” and “economic” forms of “protection and support” is required for the identification of particular forms and functions of patronage in historical contexts. The vagueness of the term “patronage” as a sociological category has evidently led to a wide variety of different applications in historical and sociological research, the results of which are difficult to harmonise from the point of view of quantitative social research. Useful as they are, studies of the flows of material support (“economic patronage”) could equally run under the label “gift-giving,” as long as no set criteria are defined to distinguish “patronage” from “prestation,” and both from “exchange,” etc. The uses of “patronage” as an analytical term is muddled further by unclear connections with legitimation theory. Pollock (1996) and Ali (2004) have raised the question whether a distinction between “politics” and “religion” makes sense at all, in regard of the political culture of South Asian post-Vedic royal courts, and rejected Weber’s (1922) “legitimation theory,” echoed by Dumont (1966) and others, in favour of a tentative theoretical amalgamation of politics and religion *cum* aesthetics,¹⁴⁵ which evidently is not a suitable model for representing the classical Jaina “power pact” between mendicants and supporting householders, offering mutually material support and spiritual protection.¹⁴⁶

Equally, if not more, important than more refined theoretical modelling, is the further development and testing of relevant diagnostic variables, taking in account emic classification and usages of terms. On the basis of a set of role-types, generated by prosopographical analysis of primary and secondary data, it was argued, a variety of different models of “patronage” or of “patron-client relationships” can be constructed, and tested, for instance specific ideal-types of “religious,” “political,” or “economic” forms of patronage, or other sociological constructs. Specific forms of “protection and support” can also be studied on the basis of role-types alone, without higher level modelling, by simple statistics, and other forms of analysis.

While “patronage” in general is notoriously difficult to operationalise, especially on the basis of ambiguous primary sources, “economic patronage,” that is, “material support,” can relatively easily be studied on the basis of donative inscriptions, detailing the names of the sponsors of images (*mūrti*), temples, and other religious or socio-religious artefacts. For this reason, *dāna* was evidently singled out as the prime focus for research on “patronage.” The fact that the term *dāna* is not translated as such in the dictionaries shows that it actually functions as an observer category in the literature, that is, as a sociological model, not as an emic category, although this is rarely, if ever, explicated.

¹⁴⁵ From the perspective of Dumont this would point into the direction of a Hocartian model of “sacred kingship.”

¹⁴⁶ Notably, there is no evidence for householder control of Jaina mendicant orders comparable to the state control of Buddhist orders in Southeast Asia and elsewhere through patronage. The maintenance of a strict separation between politics and economics, and religion may have been one of the contributing factors of the survival of Jainism in South Asia as compared to the decline of Buddhism.

The social background of Jaina mendicants, lineage constructs, contact networks, and geographical movements of mendicants can be relatively easily studied. The main problem here is the universal conundrum of all historians, that is, incomplete, and sometimes contradictory, evidence. On an elementary level, the links between named “patrons” and “clients,” can also be investigated as networks, without qualification of the nature of the relationship, and indication of a- / symmetry or directionality.¹⁴⁷

The present case study of “patronage” relationships, designated as such in Johannes Klatt’s *Jaina-Onomasticon*, demonstrates that the difficulties in interpreting the implications of words such as “support” or “patron” in the primary sources can in principle be overcome by interrelating information from different sources with the help of sufficiently comprehensive data-sets, such as the *Jaina-Prosopography*. Meanwhile, the amount of electronically available data on Jainism has increase exponentially. Numerous digitisation projects, electronic bibliographies and library catalogues, of varying quality, have been and are being produced, particularly in India. A web-portal comparable to GRETEL for making these scattered electronic sources accessible for analysis, in form of one or more databases, is a desideratum, and would be the single most important contribution to Jaina Studies to date.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

DAK *Dānāṣṭakakathā*. In: Balbir 1982.

TS₁ *Tattvārthasūtra*, by Umāsvāti/Umāsvāmī. In: Jacobi 1906.

TS₂ *Tattvārthasūtra*, by Umāsvāti/Umāsvāmī. In: Tatia 1994.

TŚPC₁ *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritramahākāvyaṃ*. Kalikālasarvajña Hemacandrācāryaviracitaṃ. 1 Parvāṇī, Sampādaka: Muni Caraṇavijaya. 2-3-4 Parvāṇī, Sampādaka: Muni Puṇyavijaya. 5-6-7 Parvāṇī & 8-9 Parvāṇī, Sampādaka: Ramaṇīkavijaya Gaṇi & Vijayaśīlacandrasūri. Ahmadābād: Kalikālasarvajña Śrī Hemacandrācārya Navama Janmaśatābdi Smṛti Śikṣāṇa Saṃskāranidhi, 1990, 2001, 2006.

TŚPC₂ *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, by Hemacandra. See Johnson 1931-62.

YŚ *Yogaśāstra*, by Hemcandra. In: Qvarnström 2002, 2012.

Secondary Sources

Ali, Daud. *Courtly Culture and Political Life in Early Medieval India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004 (Cambridge Studies in Indian History and Society 10).

Altekar, A. S. “The Silaharas of Western India.” *Indian Culture* 2, 3 (1936) 393-434.

Apte, Vaman Shivram. *The Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Poona: Arya Bhushana Press, 1884.

Bakker, Hans T. “Royal Patronage and Religious Tolerance: The Formative Period of Gupta-Vākāṭaka Culture.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 20, 4 (2010) 461-475.

Balbir, Nalini. *Dānāṣṭakakathā. Recueil Jaina de huit histoires sur le don. Introduction, édition critique, traduction, notes*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 1982 (Publications de L’Institut de Civilisation Indienne Série-IN-8°, Fascicule 48).

¹⁴⁷ “Patronage depends upon the existence of binding hierarchical obligations” (McCulloch 2014: 201).

Balbir, Nalini, Kanhaiyalal V. Sheth, Kalpana K. Sheth & Chandrabhal B. Tripathi. *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library. Including the Holdings of the British Museum and the Victoria & Albert Museum*. Vol. 1-3. London: The British Library & The Institute of Jainology, 2006.

Bahadur, K.P. *Rasikapriyā of Keshavadāsa*. Translated into English Verse. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1972.
----- . *Selections from Rāmacandrikā of Keśavadāsa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1976.

Beach, Alison (ed.). *Monastic Matrix. A Scholarly Resource for the Study of Women's Religious Communities from 400 to 1600 CE*. Ohio State University, 2017: monasticmatrix.osu.edu

Beam, Amanda, John Bradley, Dauvit Broun, John Reuben Davies, Matthew Hammond, Michele Pasi et al. *The People of Medieval Scotland, 1093 – 1314*. Glasgow and London, 2012, www.poms.ac.uk (see PoMS).

Bodard, Gabriel (with Hugh Cayless, Mark Depauw, Leif Isaksen, K. Faith Lawrence, Sebastian Rahtz†). “Standards for Networking Ancient Person-data: Digital Approaches to Problems in Prosopographical Space.” *Digital Classics Online* 3, 2 (2017). Available: <https://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/dco/article/viewFile/37975/35966>

Bollée, Willem B. *A Cultural Encyclopedie of the Kathāsaritsāgara in Keywords. Complementary to Norman Penzer's General Index on Charles Tawney's Translation*. Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittenberg, 2015 (Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis 8).

Borooah, Anundoram. *A Practical English-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Calcutta: Wyman, 1877.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1979.
----- . “The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed.” *Poetics* 12, 4-5 (1983) 311-356 (Reprinted in: *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randall Johnson, 29-73. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).
----- . *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, (1979) 1984/1998.
----- . *On the State. Lectures at the Collège de France 1989-1992*. Edited by Patrick Champagne, Remi Lenoir, Franck Poupeau & Marie-Christine Rivière. Translated by David Fernbach. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012/2014.

Bradley, John & Harold Short. “Texts into Databases: The Evolving Field of New-Style Prosopography.” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 20 Supplement (2005) 3-24.

Bronner, Yigal (ed.). *PANDIT. A Prosopographical Database for Indic Texts*. 2015ff.:
<http://www.panditproject.org/>

Broux, Yanne. “Graeco-Egyptian Naming Practices: A Network Perspective.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 55 (2025) 706-720.

Bruhn, Klaus. “Āvaśyaka-Studies I.” *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus (Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf)*. Hg. K. Bruhn & A. Wezler, 11 49. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981 (Alt- und Neuindische Studien 23).

Bruhn, Klaus & Candrabhal Tripathi. “Jaina Concordance and Bhāṣya Concordance.” *Beiträge zur Indienforschung. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Hg. Herbert Härtel, 67-80. Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst, 1977.

Bühler, Georg. "Das Sukṛtasamkīrtana des Arisimha." *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften [Wien]. Bd. 119. VII. Abhandlung.* Wien: F. Tempsky, 1889, pp. 1-58.

----- . *The Indian Sect of the Jainas.* Translated from the German. Edited with an Outline of Jaina Mythology by J.A.S. Burgess. London: Luzac & Co, (1887) 1903 (Reprint: Calcutta: Shushil Gupta, 1963).

Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine & Sharad Chandra Ojha. "The Royal Patronage of Roving Ascetics in Mid-Nineteenth Century Rajputana." *Patronage and Popularisation, Pilgrimage and Procession. Channels of Transcultural Translation and Transmission in Early Modern South Asia. Papers in Honour of Monika Horstmann.* Edited by Heidi R. M. Pauwels, 149-166. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.

Collins, Randall. "Toward a Theory of Intellectual Change: The Social Causes of Philosophies." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 14, 2 (1989) 107-140.

----- . *The Sociology of Philosophies. A Global Theory of Intellectual Change.* Cambridge/Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.

Deeg, Max. "Has Xuanzang really been in Mathurā? Interpretatio Sinica or Interpretatio Occidentalia - How to Critically Read the Records of the Chinese Pilgrim." *Essays on East Asian Religion and Culture. Festschrift in Honour of Nishiwaki Tsuneki on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday.* Edited by Christian Wittern & Shi Lishan, 35-73 (= 426-388). Kyoto: Editorial Committee for the Festschrift in Honour of Nishiwaki Tsuneki, 2007.

Dehejia, Vidya (ed.). *Royal Patrons and Great Temple Art.* Bombay: Marg Publications, 1988.

Detige, Tillo. "Satpātrāya Samarpitaṃ. Manuscript Copies and Early Modern Digambara Saṅghas." In this Volume (2017).

Dikshit, R. K. *The Candellas of Jejākabhukti.* New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1977.

Dumont, Louis. *Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications.* Complete Revised English Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1966) 1980.

Dundas, Paul. *History, Scripture and Controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect.* London: Routledge, 2007 (Routledge Advances in Jaina Studies 2).

Eck, Werner (ed.). *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserlichen Prosopographie.* Kolloquium Köln 24. - 26. November 1991. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1993.

----- . "Eine prosopographische Datenbank oder die PIR in computergestützter Form." *Datenbanken in der Alten Geschichte.* Edited by M. Fell et al., 82-90. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae, 1994.

----- . "The Prosopographia Imperii Romani and Prosopographical Method." *Fifty Years of Prosopography. The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond.* Edited by Averil Cameron, 11-22. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003 (Proceedings of the British Academy 118).

Eisenstadt, S. N. & René Lemarchand (eds.). *Political Clientelism, Patronage, and Development.* London: Sage, 1981.

Flügel, Peter. "The Ritual Circle of the Terāpanth Śvetāmbara Jains." *Bulletin D' Études Indiennes* 13 (1996) 117-176.

----- . "Demographic Trends in Jaina Monasticism." *Studies in Jaina History and Culture. Disputes and Dialogues.* Ed. Peter Flügel, 312-398. London: Routledge, 2006 (Routledge Advances in Jaina Studies 1).

----- . "Jain Monastic Life: A Quantitative Study of the Terāpanth Śvetāmbara Mendicant Order." *Jaina Studies - Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 4 (2009) 24-29.

- , "Life and Work of Johannes Klatt." *Johannes Klatt's Jaina-Onomasticon*. Ed. Peter Flügel & Kornelius Krümpelmann, 9-164. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2016 (Jaina Studies 1).
- , "Johannes Emil Otto Klatt (1852–1903). Forgotten Chronicler of Jainism and Bibliographer of Oriental Literature: Letters to Albrecht Weber 1874–1882, Ernst Kuhn 1881–1889, Charles Rockwell Lanman 1889 and Ehrhardt Karras 1891, with Curricula Vitae, and a Complete Bibliography of Johannes Klatt's Works." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 23, 1 (2017a) 1-76.
- , "Jaina-Prosopography: Monastic Lineages, Networks and Patronage." *Jaina Studies - Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 12 (2017b) 25-26.
- , "Klaus Bruhn (22.5.1928 - 9.5.2016)." *Jaina Studies - Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 12 (2017c) 40-44.
- , "Jaina-Prosopography I. Sociology of Jaina Names." *Jaina Studies. Select Papers from the Panel at Bangkok and Kyoto*. Sanskrit Studies Centre, Silpakorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. Edited by Nalini Balbir & Peter Flügel. Delhi: D.K. Publishers & Distributors, 2018a (Proceedings of the 16th World Sanskrit Conference, Bangkok 2015).
- , *Askese und Devotion: Das rituelle System der Terāpanth Jaina*. Dettelbach: Röhl Verlag, 2018b (Alt- und Neuindische Studien)
- Geertz, Clifford. *Negara. The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Granoff, Phyllis. "Patrons, Overlords and Artisans: Some Comments on the Intricacies of Religious Donations in Medieval Jainism." *Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute* 54-55 (1994-95) 269-291 (Sir William Jones Commemoration Volume, Appeared September 1997).
- Granoff, Phyllis & Koichi Shinohara. "Introduction. Pilgrimage, Patrons, and Place: Localizing Sanctity in Asian Religions." *Pilgrims, Patrons and Place. Localizing Sanctity in Asian Religions*. Ed. Phyllis Granoff & Koichi Shinohara, 297-331. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2003.
- Greatrex, Joan. "Prosopographical Perspectives, or What Can be Done with Five Thousand Monastic Biographies?" *Medieval Prosopography* 20 (1999) 129-145.
- Hartwell, Robert M. et al. (ed.). *China Biographical Database (CBDB)*. Fairbank Center for Chinese Studies, Harvard University, 2017. <https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/cbdb>.
- Hemacandra. *Yogaśāstra*. See YŚ & Qvarnström 2002, 2012.
- , *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra*. See TŚPC₁ & Johnson 1931-1962.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. *Die Pāli-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang in Nord-Thailand*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission 2).
- Jacobi, Hermann. "Eine Jaina Dogmatik. Umāsvāti's Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra. Übersetzt und erläutert." *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 60 (1906) 287 325, 512-551.
- Jani, Arunoday Natvarlal. *A Critical Study of Sriharsa's Naisadhiyacaritam*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1957 (M. S. University of Baroda Research Series 2).

Jeffreys, Martin et al. *Prosopography of the Byzantine World, 2016*. London: King's College London, 2017 (See PBW).

Johnson, Helen M. (tr.). *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra, or The Lives of Sixty-three Illustrious Persons, by Ācārya Śrī Hemacandra*. 6 Vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931-1962 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 51, 77, 125, 108, 139, 140).

Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collection of Manuscripts Deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Volume XVII: Jaina Literature and Philosophy. Part V: Agamika Literature (Ten Appendices)*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1954.

Keats-Rohan, Katherine S. B. "Introduction." *Prosopography Approaches and Applications. A Handbook*. Edited by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 2-32. Oxford: Prosopographica et Genealogica, 2007a (Prosopographica et Genealogica 13).

-----, "Biography, Identity and Names: Understanding the Pursuit of the Individual in Prosopography." *Prosopography Approaches and Applications. A Handbook*. Edited by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 139-181. Oxford: Prosopographica et Genealogica, 2007b (Prosopographica et Genealogica 13).

-----, (ed.). *COEL Database (Continental Origins of English Landholders 1066-1166)*. Oxford: Unit for Prosopographical Research at Linacre College, 2001. www.coelweb.co.uk/index.html

Klatt, Johannes. *Jaina-Onomasticon*. Ed. Peter Flügel & Kornelius Krümpelmann. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Jaina Studies 1).

Laughlin, Jack. C. *Ārādhakamūrti/Ādhiṣṭhāyakamūrti - Popular Piety, Politics, and the Medieval Jain Temple Portrait*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2003a.

-----, "Portraiture and Jain Sacred Place: The Patronage of the Ministers Vastupala and Tejaḥpala." *Pilgrims, Patrons and Place. Localizing Sanctity in Asian Religions*. Ed. Phyllis Granoff & Koichi Shinohara, 297-331. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2003b.

Lilie, Ralph-Johannes, Claudia Ludwig, Beate Zielke & Thomas Pratsch (ed.). *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit Online*. Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Nach Vorarbeiten F. Winkelmanns erstellt, 2017: www.degruyter.com/view/db/pmbz

Lüders, Heinrich. *List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to About A.D. 400. With the Exception of those of Aśoka*. Appendix to Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India Volume X. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1912.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Trust and Power. Two Works by Niklas Luhmann*. Translated by Howard Davies, John Raffan & Kathryn Rooney. Chichester: Wiley, (1973) 1975/1979.

McCulloch, Andrew D. *Charisma and Patronage. Reasoning with Max Weber*. London: Ashgate, 2014.

Minkowski, Chistopher, Rosalind O'Hanlon & Anand Venkatkrishnan. "Social History in the Study of Indian Intellectual Cultures?" *South Asian History and Culture* 6, 1 (2015) 1-9.

Mommsen, Theodor. "Mommsen's Application to the Berlin Academy." Mommsen 31.5.1874. In: Eck 2003: 21-22.

Monier-Williams, Monier (comp.). *A Dictionary, English and Sanscrit*. London: W.H. Allen & Co., 1851.

-----, (comp.). *Sanskrit-English Dictionary. New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899 (Reprint: New Delhi: Marwah Publications, 1986).

Munshi, Kanaiyalal Maneklal. *The Glory that was Gurjaradeśa. The Imperial Gūrjaras*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1944.

Oliva, Marilyn. "Counting Nuns: A Prosopography of Late Medieval English Nuns in the Diocese of Norwich." *Medieval Prosopography* 16, 1 (1995) 25-55.

Ousaka, Yumi, Yamazaki, Moriichi & Masahiro Miyao. "Automatic Analysis of the Canon in Middle Indo-Aryan by Personal Computer I." *Literary and Linguistic Computing (Oxford)* 9, 2 (1994) 125-136.

Ousaka, Yumi & Moriichi Yamazaki. "Automatic Analysis of the Canon in Middle Indo-Aryan by Personal Computer II." *Literary and Linguistic Computing (Oxford)* 11, 1 (1996) 9-17.

Owen, Lisa N. "Kings of Ascetics? Evidence of Patronage in Ellora's Jain Caves." *Artibus Asiae* 70, 2 (2010) 181-225.

Padmasāgarasūri, Ācārya (Āśīrvāda Na Preraṇā). *Kailāsa Śrutasāgara Granthasūcī: Jaina Hastalikhita Sāhitya. Descriptive Catalogue of Jain Manuscripts*. Khaṇḍa 1.-1.1.16. Gandhinagar: Kailāsa Śrutasāgara Jñānamandira, Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Ārādhana Kendra, Koba Tīrtha, 2003-2013. PCBE = *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, I*: Mandouze, André. *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-533)*. D'après la documentation élaborée par Anne-Marie La Bonnardière. Avec la collaboration de Claude-Hélène Lacroix, Serge Lancel, Henri Irénée Marrou, Charles Munier, Elisabeth Paoli-Lafaye, Stan-Michel Pellistrandi, Charles Pietri, Françoise Pontuer. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1982 (Études d'antiquités africaines Année 1982, Volume 2).

PIR = *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*. Berlin 1897-2015 (Various editors). pir.bbaw.de.

PLRE = Jones, Arnold Hugh Martin, John Robert Martindale & John Morris. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Volume 1-3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 1980, 1992.

PmbZ = *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Erste Abteilung (641–867)*. Hrsg. von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, nach Vorarbeiten F. Winkelmanns erstellt von Ralph-Johannes Lilie, Claudia Ludwig, Thomas Pratsch, Ilse Rochow, Beate Zielke u. a., 7 Bde. (Prolegomena + Bde. I-VI), Berlin–New York: W. de Gruyter 1998–2001. <http://www.pmbz.de>.

PoMS = *The People of Medieval Scotland, 1093 – 1314*. Edited by Amanda Beam, John Bradley, Dauvit Broun, John Reuben Davies, Matthew Hammond, Michele Pasin et al. Glasgow & London, 2012, www.poms.ac.uk.

PBW = *Prosopography of the Byzantine World, 2016*. Edited by Martin Jeffreys et al. London: King's College London, 2017. <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk>.

Pollock, Sheldon. "The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, 300-1300: Transculturation, Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideology." *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit. Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*. Edited by Jan E. M. Houben, 197-248. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996 (Brill's Indological Library 13).

----- *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men. Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Pouchepadass, Jacques. "Itinerant Kings and Touring Officials: Circulation as a Modality of Power in India, 1700-1947." *Society and Circulation. Mobile People and Itinerant Cultures in South Asia, 1750-1950*. Ed. Claude Markovits, Jacques Pouchepadass & Sanjay Subrahmanyam, 40-274. New Delhi, Permanent Black, 2002.

Punjab University Library, Lahore, Pakistan, Geumgang University, Nonsan, Korea & Department of South Asian Studies, University of Vienna, Austria. *A Study of the Manuscripts of the Woolner Collection, Lahore*. 2010. www.istb.univie.ac.at/cgi-bin/smwcm/smwcm.cgi.

Qvarnström, Olle. *The Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra. A Twelfth Century Handbook on Śvetāmbara Jainism*. Translated by Olle Qvarnström. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002 (Harvard Oriental Series 61).

----- *A Handbook on the Three Jewels of Jainism. The Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra*. Mumbai: Hindi Granth Karyalay, 2012 (Pandit Nathuram Premi Research Series Volume 29).

Rebenich, Stefan. "Mommsen, Harnack und die Prosopographie der Spätantike." *Studia Patristica* 29 (1997) 109-118.

Rüpke, Jörg. "A Prosopographical Data Base of Cultic Personnel in Ancient Rome." *Revue Informatique et Statistique dans les Sciences Humaines* 30, 1-4 (1994) 127-137.

----- *Fasti sacerdotum. Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr. Unter Beifügung einer CD zur Erschließung des prosopographischen Materials von Bernd Nüsslein. Unter Mitarbeit von Helmut Pannke*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2005 (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 12) [Translation by David Richardson: Oxford University Press, 2008].

----- *Römische Priester in der Antike. Ein biographisches Lexikon*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2007.

Salomon, Richard. *Indian Epigraphy. A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Śarmā, Vikāsa. *Critical Study of the Jayasiṃhakaḥpadrūpa of Ratnākaraḍikṣita, 18th Century, Manual of Hindu Rituals and Religious Observances*. Jayapura: Rāshṭriya Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Kendra, 2004.

Schmiedchen, Annette. *Herrschergenealogie und Religiöses Patronat. Die Inschriftenkultur der Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Śīlāhāras and Yādavas (8. bis 13. Jahrhundert)*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2014 (Gonda Indological Studies 17).

Schopen, Gregory. "What's in a Name: The Religious Function of the Early Donative Inscriptions." *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996/2004.

Schubring, Walther. *Die Jaina-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek. Neuerwerbungen seit 1891*. Unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Günther Weibgen. Beschrieben von Walther Schubring Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1944 (Verzeichnis der Handschriften im Deutschen Reich. Teil 3: Die Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek, N.F., Reihe 1: Die orientalischen Handschriften, Bd. 1).

Shalom, Naama. *Re-ending the Mahābhārata. The Rejection of Dharma in the Sanskrit Epic*. Albany: SUNY, 2017.

Sircar, Dinesh Chandra. *Indian Epigraphy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1965.

----- *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1966.

Spann, Othmar. *Gesellschaftslehre*. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: Verlag Quelle & Meyer, 1918/1923.

Speziale, Fabrizio & Carl W. Ernst (ed.). *Perso-Indica. Analytical Survey of Persian Works on Indian Learned Traditions*. 2000ff. <http://www.perso-indica.net/>

-----, *Perso-Indica. Analytical Survey of Persian Works on Indian Learned Traditions. Report - 2015.*
http://www.perso-indica.net/upload/docs/25_1_Perso-Indica%20Report%202015.pdf

Stein, Burton. "On Patronage and Vijayanagara Religious Foundations." In: Stoler Miller 1992: 160-167.

Stoler Miller, Barbara (ed.). *Powers of Art. Patronage in Indian Culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992a.

Stoler Miller, Barbara & Richard Eaton: 'Introduction.' In: Stoler Miller 1992a: 1-16 = 1992b.

Talbot, Cythia. "Temples, Donors, and Gifts: Patterns of Patronage in Thirteenth-Century South India." *Journal of Asian Studies* 50, 2 (1991) 308-340.

Tatia, Nathmal [Tāṭiyā, Nathamala] (tr.). *Tattvārtha-Sūtra of Umāsvāti/Umāsvāmī.* Translated by Nathmal Tatia as *That Which Is.* With the Combined Commentaries of Umāsvāti/Umāsvāmī, Pūjyapāda and Siddhasenagaṇi. New York: Harper Collins, 1994.

Thapar, Romila. "Cultural Transaction in Early India: Tradition and Patronage." *Social Scientist* 15.2 (1987) 3-31 (Qureishi Memorial Lectures 1987 St. Stephen's College, Delhi University) (Reprint: *Cultural Transaction and Early India. Tradition and Patronage.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987/1994).

-----, "Patronage and the Community." In: Stoler Miller 1992: 1-34 (Reprint: *Cultural Pasts. Essays in Early Indian History.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000/2005, pp. 589-609).

-----, *The Past Before Us. Historical Traditions of Early North India.* Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Trikha, Himal. *DiPAL: Digambara Philosophers in the Age of Logic.* www.dipal.org.

Tripathi, Rama Shankar. *History of Kanauj. To the Moslem Conquest.* Motilal Banarsidas, 1989.

Tulsi, Ganadhipati (Synod Chief). *Jaina Pāribhāṣika Śabdakoṣa. Dictionary of Technical Terms of Jainism.* English Version. Lexicographer: Acharya Mahaprajna. Editor-in-Chief: Yuvacharya Mahashramana. Editor: Mukhya Niyojika Sadhvi Vishrutavibha. English Translator: Muni Mahendra Kumar. Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bharati & Jain Vishva Bharati University, 2009.

Umāsvāti/Umāsvāmī. *Tattvārthasūtra.* See TS_{1,2}, Jacobi 1906, Tatia 1994.

University of Madras. *New Catalogus Catalogorum. A Complete Up-to-date Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors.* Published under the Authority of the University of Madras. Vol. 1. Editor-in-chief: Kuppaswami Sastri. Madras: University of Madras, 1937 (Provisional Fasciculus).

-----, *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors.* Published under the Authority of the University of Madras. Editor-in-chief: Vol. 1: C. Kunhan Raja (1949), Vol. 1 Revised Edition: Venkatarama Raghavan (1968); Vol. 2-5: Venkatarama Raghavan (1966, 1967, 1968, 1969); Vol. 6-11: K. Kunjuni Raja (1971, 1973, 1974, 1977, 1978); Vol. 11: K. Kunjuni Raja & N. Veezhinathan (1983); Vol. 12-13: N. Veezhinathan (1988, 1991); Vol.14: N. Veezhinathan & E.R. Rama Bai (2000); Vol. 15-36: Sini Ruddha Dash (2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d, 2007e, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2011e, 2011f, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c, 2013d, 2013e, 2013f, 2013g, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d. Madras: University of Madras, 1949-2014 (Madras University Sanskrit Series Vols. 18, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62).

-----, *Catalogues, Lists, etc., Used in the New Catalogus Catalogorum with the Abbreviations used for Them.* Madras: University of Madras, 1984.

Velankar, Hari Damodar (comp.). *Jinaratnaśā. An Alphabetical List of Jaina Works and Authors*. Vol. 1. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1944 (Government Oriental Series Class C No. 4).

Verboven, Konraad, Myriam Carlier & Jan Dumolyn. "A Short Manual to the Art of Prosopography." *Prosopography Approaches and Applications. A Handbook*. Edited by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 35-69. Oxford: Prosopographica et Genealogica, 2007 (Prosopographica et Genealogica 13).

Weber, Albrecht. *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit-Handschriften*. Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. Herausgegeben von dem Königlichen Oberbibliothekar Geheimen Regierungsrath Dr. Pertz. Erster Band. Berlin: Verlag der Nicolai'schen Buchhandlung, 1853.

----- *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prākṛit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Zweiter Band. Erste, Zweite & Dritte Abtheilung. Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. Fünfter Band. Berlin: A. W. Schade, 1886, 1888, 1891a [Outer cover: 1892].

Weber, Max. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*. Bd. I-III. 6. Auflage. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1920, (1916-17) 1921, 1921/1978-1987.

----- *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriß der verstehenden Soziologie*. 5. von Johannes Winckelmann revidierte Auflage (Erstausgabe: Marianne Weber 1922). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1972/1985.

----- *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth & Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968/1978.

Williams, Robert Hamilton Blair. *Jaina Yoga. A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakācāras*. London: Oxford University Press, (1963) 1983.

Willis, Michael et al. *SIDDHAM. A Resource for the Study of Inscriptions from South and Central Asia*. London: The British Museum, 2017. www.alt.damayata.com.

Winkelmann, Friedhelm, Ralph-Johannes Lilie et al. *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinische Zeit*. Berlin, 1998-2001 (See PmbZ).

Wissowa, Georg et al. (Hg.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlerscher Verlag, 1893-1980.

Yamazaki, Moriichi & Yumi Ousaka. *A Word Index and Reverse Word Index to Early Jain Canonical Texts [Texte imprimé]: Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttaraññhāyā, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiyāim*. Tokyo: Chūō Academic Research Institute, 1999.

Zysk, Kenneth. "The Use of Manuscript Catalogues as Sources of Regional Intellectual History in India's Early Modern Period." *Aspects of Manuscript Culture in South India*. Edited by Saraju Rath, 253-287. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2012.