In the 1620s Siddhicandra, a Jain monk, wrote a Sanskrit text about Jain-Mughal relations titled Bhanucandragani­
carita (Biography of Bhanucandra).1 As I argue below, the Bhanucandragani­
carita is an innovative work, both for its topic and its approach to that topic. The Bhanucandragani­
carita claims, by its title, to be a biography of a specific Jain mendicant, but it is both more and less than one man’s life story. The work begins and ends with episodes that feature interactions between Jain and Mughal elites. It includes narratives throughout that, with only a few exceptions, focus on emperors Akbar and Jahangir, along with a few of their close associates such as Abu al-Fazl and Nur Jahan. The Bhanucandragani­
carita is, to my knowledge, the first Sanskrit text to focus on Mughal figures, not intermittently or in part, but rather throughout its basic narrative structure.2 Moreover, Siddhicandra describes both Mughal and Jain elites in unusual ways when we read his text against the wider Sanskrit tradition. He styles the Mughal kings and key members of the imperial court as participants in a Sanskrit-based culture of kingship. Siddhicandra mainly recognizes the Persianate culture that flourished at the Mughal court when he discusses his own activities as a Jain monk. In this article, I first discuss Siddhicandra’s topic choice and then turn to his eye-catching approach to depicting Mughals and Jains. I argue that Siddhicandra’s Bhanucandragani­
carita marks a moment in Sanskrit historiography when Muslim kings had ceased to be other and so could be fully integrated within Sanskrit literary norms, even as their Persianate ruling culture provided a fresh model for Siddhicandra’s own self-fashioning.

An Old Topic and a New Emphasis
Siddhicandra’s Bhanucandragani­
carita is best understood within two Sanskrit literary contexts, one of which is Jain ascetic biographies. Jain authors had often held up the lives of monks as edifying examples for Jain followers, and this interest accelerated from the thirteenth century onward. For instance, Prabhacandra narrates the lives of twenty-two virtuous monks in the 1278 Prabhavakacarita (Illustrious Biographies). As John Cort has explained, such “public glorifying, both to the Jain community but also to the broader Indian society, has long been seen as an important virtue of a true monk. It has served to justify the involvement of world-renouncing monks in worldly affairs.” In later centuries, some authors elected to focus biographies on a single mendicant, and this genre blossomed after members of the Tapa Gaccha, a branch of Svetambara Jainism to which Bhanucandra and Siddhicandra belonged, established relations with Akbar’s court in 1583.4 Tapa Gaccha ascetics maintained an imperial presence until the late 1610s, and they produced numerous works about their time at court, both during the experience and for decades thereafter.5 Temporally, Siddhicandra falls in the middle of about half a dozen discrete authors who wrote about relations between Tapa Gaccha monks and the Mughal courts of Akbar and Jahangir. In an opening verse, Siddhicandra expresses his intention — within this literary context of Jain accounts that glorified the lives of mendicants and thereby justified them spending time at affluent courts — to focus on one part of Bhanucandra’s life:
Bhanucandra, a great teacher and protector of sages, gained fame and good fortune by enlightening glorious Shah Akbar, the best of men. The Jain teaching flourished as a result, and so, let this part of Bhanucandra’s story be heard in full detail.6

Indeed, Siddhicandra treats Bhanucandra’s relations with the Mughals at length in his text and, with only a few exceptions, excludes other parts of Bhanucandra’s life story.7

The Bhanucandraganicarita is also part of a tradition of Sanskrit historical narratives that feature Indo-Muslim political figures, dating back to the late twelfth century. This collection of several dozen Sanskrit works has been little theorized to date.8 Notable for understanding Siddhicandra’s innovation is that earlier Sanskrit historical works had often featured Indo-Muslim figures extensively, but generally within discussions of non-Muslim dynasties (e.g., the Chauhans) or individuals (e.g., Prithviraj).9 Siddhicandra would not necessarily have known about many of these prior works, but he was probably familiar with Jain prabandha (narrative) texts from the first half of the fourteenth century that discuss relations, most famously, between Jinaprabha and Muhammad bin Tughluq.10 The Bhanucandraganicarita stands apart from earlier Jain prabandhas and the wider tradition of Sanskrit histories for its focus on Jain-Mughal relations as its main subject.

The Bhanucandraganicarita’s narrative arc consists of Jain links with the Mughal court. Siddhicandra opens the narrative portion of his text with the story of the 1583 meeting between Hirajivaya, the Tapa Gaccha leader at the time, and Akbar. Siddhicandra ends his work, more than thirty years later, with his own triumphant return to the imperial court in 1616 following an argument with Jahangir. Jahangir exiled Jain monks from the Mughal court shortly thereafter, but Siddhicandra elected to omit this event.11 Instead, he closes his text with the 1616 return to court, which was the final moment of positive contact between Tapa Gaccha monks and the Mughal kings. With the exception of two brief passages, all of the intervening stories in the Bhanucandraganicarita take place at the Mughal court and feature Mughal political figures (although not all concern Bhanucandra). In other words, Jain-Mughal links furnish the narrative thread that binds together the otherwise disparate narratives throughout the Bhanucandraganicarita. In contrast, most other Jains who wrote on relations with the Mughals incorporated the subject into texts on other topics as well, often in biographies that covered at great length parts of their subjects’ lives that did not involve the imperial court. Among his immediate and slightly later contemporaries, Siddhicandra was unusual in his focus on Jain-Mughal relations.12

Siddhicandra wrote for a local Jain audience based in and around Gujarat. The only known manuscript copy of the Bhanucandraganicarita is in Bikaner today.13 We have no evidence that Siddhicandra intended his work to be read by Mughal elites who, generally, did not know Sanskrit. In this sense, the Bhanucandraganicarita is similar to Rajput Hindi works, such as Amrit Rai’s Mancarit (Biography of Man Singh, 1585), which Allison Busch argued were “poetic creations” that attempted “to record encounters with Mughal power for their local audiences.”14 Thus, I seek to explain why Siddhicandra’s topic choice and approaches were relevant for his intended Jain audience. To do this, it is helpful to understand the Bhanucandraganicarita to reflect political realities and, also, to constitute a set of literary choices.

In terms of political realities, Siddhicandra wrote his Bhanucandraganicarita shortly after the end of more than three decades of Tapa Gaccha relations with the central Mughal court and so was representing a major period in the group’s recent history. There was also a personal angle in that Siddhicandra had spent much of his youth as part of the Tapa Gaccha contingent at the Mughal court. In addition to writing about a recent set of experiences that had changed the Tapa Gaccha, he also perhaps wrote to memorialize and even mourn a world to which he had recently lost access, as I discuss below. Today, the Bhanucandraganicarita is a valuable work for reconstructing the social history of the Mughal court, and I have used it as such elsewhere.15 That said, my interests in this article tilt toward Siddhicandra’s literary innovation in the work.

Siddhicandra made a literary decision in the Bhanucandraganicarita to welcome a novel political reality into a Jain vision of the world as a force that might open new creative possibilities for Sanskrit intellectuals and Jain communities. Indeed, Tapa Gaccha-Mughal relations proved a generative subject in Sanskrit, both during their heyday and decades after they had halted in real life.16 Numerous Jain authors found in Mughal culture imperial models that they adapted to valorize Jain ascetics, a literary move that added specificity to a general tendency in Indian religious discourses to adopt royal models.17 Within this larger trend, Siddhicandra’s decisions regarding how to depict the Mughals and Jain monks,
respectively, stand out in certain ways. In the remainder of this essay, I discuss some of Siddhicandra’s literary innovations in how he treats the Mughal and Jain figures who populate his text.

**Writing about the Mughal Self and the Jain Other**

Siddhicandra depicts the Mughals using traditional norms of Sanskrit-based kingship, whereas he portrays himself as a participant in the Indo-Persian culture that flourished at the imperial court. Neither literary decision was without precedent in Sanskrit. But combined they make for an extraordinary textual landscape where Siddhicandra models himself, in part, on the Mughal Other, even as the Mughals cease to be other in any identifiable way. The common thread between these two textual choices is that Siddhicandra elected to integrate the Mughals, quite fully, into Sanskrit literature. But he took two distinct approaches. He treats the Mughals using established Sanskrit tropes with some Jain-specific references mixed in, marking almost nothing distinctively Indo-Persian about these kings. Only in describing his own activities as a Jain monk does Siddhicandra choose to recognize a novel cultural option—namely, the Persianate tradition, to an extent rarely seen in earlier Sanskrit literature. These literary choices merit further explication, individually and together.

In his opening chapter, Siddhicandra devotes significant attention to key Mughal figures, whom he depicts as fully steeped in Sanskrit culture and traditional Indian kingship. In an introductory section, Siddhicandra devotes roughly twenty-five verses each to praising Agra and Akbar and a dozen verses to Abu al-Fazl (Akbar’s vizier). In contrast, Bhanucandra is allotted only seven verses, several of which concern his time at the imperial Mughal court. Even more striking is how Siddhicandra describes the Mughals. He compares Akbar to several model Indian sovereigns, opening, for instance, with this verse:

> Glorious Shah Akbar ruled the city of Agra with such righteous conduct that nobody remembered Rama anymore.20

Fifteen verses later, Siddhicandra equates Akbar with Krishna, another avatar of Vishnu, writing, “Like Krishna, [Akbar] protects the six philosophies, animals, and villages.”21 Siddhicandra’s invocation of the “six philosophies” (*saddarsana*), referring to the six time-honored Hindu philosophical traditions, indicates his strong reliance here on traditional tropes. After all, Jain thought—to which Siddhicandra describes the Mughals as partial in several subsequent episodes (discussed below)—is not included in the six philosophies. Siddhicandra concludes his opening description of Akbar with a comparison to Indra:

> [Akbar] shone intensely as he was served, like Indra, by wise men from across the earth who have no equals in intellect.22

Such verses suggest Siddhicandra’s own positive view of the Mughals (especially given that this text was not meant for Mughal eyes). They also indicate that Siddhicandra judged it appropriate to draw on the vast range of Sanskrit idioms and conventions for describing the Mughals as Indian sovereigns.

Siddhicandra depicts Akbar as invested in and, to some degree, educated about Sanskrit knowledge systems. Most notably, in chapter 2 of the *Bhanucandraganicarita*, Siddhicandra tells his readers that Akbar wished to learn the thousand names of the sun in Sanskrit. As a matter of historical fact, Akbar’s sun veneration is confirmed by Persian and European sources. Siddhicandra narrates the story as a competition wherein Jains bested the Brahmins at court and Akbar emerged as a king steeped in Sanskrit practices. According to Siddhicandra, one day in 1587 Akbar requested that Brahmins at court provide him with a copy of the *Suryasahasranama* (Thousand Names of the Sun). The Brahmins did so, but Akbar determined that only Bhanucandra was qualified to provide instruction in its proper recitation. Noteworthy for my purposes is that Siddhicandra depicts Akbar as initiating the narrative movement of this story, both asking for the *Suryasahasranama* and declaring its best teacher. After Bhanucandra did as the king requested, Akbar then “forgot any other taste (*anyarasas*)” and recited the sun’s Sanskrit names. This lost taste probably refers to Islamic prayer, which was partially displaced by Akbar’s sun veneration as per Badauni, an unofficial historian of Akbar’s reign. Siddhicandra closes this episode by declaring Bhanucandra’s fame to rise in step with Akbar’s Sanskrit recitation:

> After reading in the morning daily, in the public assembly of leaders, [Akbar] shone with rays of virtue and a majestic light from his teacher [Bhanucandra].

Then, the Jain teaching was known to flourish, and [Bhanucandra’s] fame danced like a dancer across the three worlds.26
Siddhicandra’s way of narrating this tale accords with his general tendency to depict the Mughal kings as steeped in Sanskrit culture alone. Building on the model he uses for Akbar, Siddhicandra similarly praises Abu al-Fazl, specifically upholding the vizier as a paradigm of Sanskrit learning. One passage is worth quoting in full:

Shaykh Abu al-Fazl’s wisdom extended across the vast ocean of all Sanskrit learning, including Jainism, mimamsa, Buddhism, sankhya, vaisesika, carvaka, jaininiya, Sanskrit literature (kavya), yoga, vedanta, lexicography, music, drama, aesthetic tropes, mythology (purana), metrical works, the science of omens, astrology, mathematics, physiognomy, political science, erotics, veterinary sciences, and guardianship. In terms of Sanskrit writing (vannaya), there is nothing that he has not seen or heard.27

Siddhicandra’s vision of Abu al-Fazl as embodying the entirety of Sanskrit learning stands in sharp contrast to depictions by other rough contemporaries. For instance, writing a decade or two earlier, Devavimala represents Abu al-Fazl as discoursing about Islamic theology.28 Such a comparison points up the choice that Siddhicandra made in eliding most traces of Persianate and Islamic traditions and drawing more narrowly on Sanskrit norms for elaborating the culture milieu of Mughal political elites. In reality, Abu al-Fazl possessed familiarity with both Indo-Persian and Sanskrit knowledge systems, the latter evidenced by his detailed account of the subject in his Ain-i Akbari (Akbar’s Institutes).29 In choosing to emphasize only one domain of knowledge, however, Siddhicandra crafts a vision of a Sanskrit-steeped Mughal court.

Elsewhere in his work, Siddhicandra acknowledges the political realities of Mughal India, but he tends to bring details about the Mughals back to Sanskrit literature culture. One example concerns Abu al-Fazl. At one point, Siddhicandra narrates that Prince Murad fell ill while on a military campaign in the Deccan and so required assistance. Akbar dispatched Abu al-Fazl, who brought the campaign to a satisfactory conclusion. This story features a military event and thereby acknowledges the Mughals’ imperial expansionist program. However, Siddhicandra closes the episode by noting that, for his service, Akbar bestowed on Abu al-Fazl the Sanskrit-derived title, “Pillar of the Army” (dalathambhana).30 As discussed below, Siddhicandra records the Mughals as giving Persian titles but only to Jain monks.

Later in the text, too, Siddhicandra portrays Abu al-Fazl as an intellectual heavyweight on matters usually considered internal to Sanskrit traditions. For instance, he says that Bhanucandra instructed Abu al-Fazl in Sanskrit philosophy using the compendium Saddarsanasamuccaya (Collection of the Six Schools).31 In another scene, Siddhicandra narrates an occasion on which the Mughals questioned the Tapa Gaccha leader Vijayasena about whether Jains believe in God. The Mughals considered atheism to be beyond the pale of acceptability, and so the onus rested on Vijayasena to prove that there were possible theistic understandings of Jain theology. This debate is narrated in numerous Jain texts and, like other writers, Siddhicandra begins with Akbar questioning Vijayasena.32 But soon, in the Bhanucandraganicarita, Akbar retreated from the scene and the learned Sanskrit pandit Abu al-Fazl took over to adjudicate questions debated between Vijayasena and a Brahmin such as whether Jains are “outside of the Vedas” (vedabahya).33 Siddhicandra gives the exchange between the two in a terse fashion that relies on extensive knowledge of Jain and Brahminical positions going back centuries. There are several other recountings of this exchange in Jain-authored Sanskrit works, and Siddhicandra’s version is by far the most technical. Siddhicandra’s Abu al-Fazl appears fluent in these debates and comfortable adjudicating the argument.

In chapter 4 of the Bhanucandraganicarita, Siddhicandra introduces a new cast of Mughal characters, namely, Jahangir and Nur Jahan, and he depicts both using similar traditional Sanskrit imagery. For instance, Siddhicandra narrates Jahangir ascending the throne after Akbar’s death and likens the newly crowned Jahangir’s leisure activities to those of “Vishnu in heaven” (svarge hariryatha).34 Siddhicandra includes quite culturally specific images in this passage, such as Jahangir enjoying “the wonder of hearing the clear singing of kinnaris (celestial musicians).”35 Siddhicandra also describes Nur Jahan who, he says, walked into the public audience hall of the Mughal court radiating like the goddess Lakshmi.36 This is historically rather unlikely, but imagining the occasion allowed Siddhicandra to describe Nur Jahan’s beauty in a classical head-to-toe description, favored by many Sanskrit poets.37

Siddhicandra also describes the Mughals as enacting Jain precepts at times. For instance, when Akbar first called the Tapa Gaccha leader Hiravijaya to court, the king asked the monk about dharma. After hearing about the Jain tradition, Akbar found his mind swayed by compassion (kripa).38 Later, upon learning about
Hiravijaya’s death, Bhanucandra convinced Akbar to donate land to house a stupa in memory of Hiravijaya at the village of Una, near Diu. Another episode features Akbar arriving at Gwalior and feeling distressed (kheda-bhrt) at finding some of the large Jain icons there mutilated (vyangani). Akbar ordered the statues repaired.

Jahangir, too, becomes imbued with Jain inclinations amidst the heated exchange, Siddhicandra depicts Jahangir’s order that the Jain monk take a wife. In the Grantha learned Persian and even read Persian texts (dalathambhana), as discussed below. In such moments, the Mughals appear to participate in not only a Sanskrit-based culture of kingship but also a more specifically Jain version thereof. The Bhanucandraganicarita offers precious little commentary about the Persianate culture that was definitional to the Mughal court, unless we look at Siddhicandra’s representation of himself.

When Siddhicandra discusses the Persianate culture that flourished at the Mughal court in his text, he generally associates it with himself. Siddhicandra tells his readers that Akbar gave him the Persian title khushfahm (Wise Man), a striking linguistic contrast to Abu al-Fazl’s Sanskritic fashioning as dalakhambhana (mentioned above). Siddhicandra mentions twice that he learned Persian and even read Persian texts (parasigrantha) to the Mughal princes and king. At one point, Siddhicandra argues with Jahangir about both the merits of asceticism and Siddhicandra’s refusal of Jahangir’s order that the Jain monk take a wife. In the midst of the heated exchange, Siddhicandra depicts himself as citing the example of Ibrahim ibn Adham, the king of Balkh known for renunciation in the Persian philosophical concept of relativism (syadvada), as discussed below. In such moments, the Mughals as sharing Sanskrit culture while his mentions of Persian more narrowly concern himself.

Siddhicandra wrote in the 1620s, and this timing may be critical to explaining his literary choices in the text. At the end of his Bhanucandraganicarita, Siddhicandra tells his readers about an intense argument he had with Jahangir involving Jain asceticism and Mughal authority in the 1610s. The debate, about which I have written and which I have translated in full elsewhere, ends with Jahangir exiling Siddhicandra and all other Jain monks, save for Bhanucandra, from the Mughal court. Jahangir later relented, however, and invited Siddhicandra back to court. Siddhicandra closes his Bhanucandraganicarita with this triumphant return. Jahangir soon changed his mind again, however, and exiled Jain ascetics from populated centers across the Mughal kingdom in 1618. Like the first order, Jahangir later rescinded this ban, but Jain monks never regained their place at the Mughal court. Siddhicandra wrote his text after this cataclysmic event, and perhaps memorizing what he lost is part of why he penned the work, especially including references to his own links with Persianate culture despite the dominance of Sanskrit tropes in his text. Siddhicandra perhaps wrote the world as he wished it still existed.

Siddhicandra’s Bhanucandraganicarita demonstrates that Jain thinkers perceived value for their local communities in adapting models of Mughal sovereignty. Several Jain authors slightly later concurred with this assessment and wrote further accounts of Jain-Mughal relations that had ceased decades earlier. For instance, Hemavijaya and Vallabha Pathaka completed works in the 1630s and the 1650s, respectively, that recorded Jain-Mughal relations that had ended in the 1610s. Even in the late seventeenth century, Meghavijaya wrote about Tapa Gaccha leaders as “victorious kings on a continual march accompanied by retinues of monks as armies.” Given the Tapa Gaccha’s history of adapting Mughal imagery in particular, early modern readers likely read Meghavijaya’s descriptions against that specific political
backdrop. Siddhicandra participated in this broader trend of Jain writings that used Mughal models of kingship in an ascetic context, although in a remarkable and somewhat unusual set of narrative choices.

Conclusion

The _Bhanucandraganicarita_ represents a stunning moment in Sanskrit historiography. It is the first Sanskrit text to treat cross-cultural relations with Mughal elites as its main subject. This literary choice is all the more marked by its social background, which Siddhicandra chooses to omit, namely, the cessation of relations between Jain monks and Mughal elites. Also noteworthy are Siddhicandra’s literary choices regarding how to depict Jain and Mughal figures, respectively. The _Bhanucandraganicarita_ constitutes a development in Sanskrit historiography and literary culture wherein the Mughals ceased to be other in any identifiable way, except as offering a new cultural context for Jain self-expression. In both choices, Siddhicandra prioritized integrating the Mughals into Sanskrit literature, including as a source to spark new ideas and ways of formulating identities. Accordingly, Siddhicandra’s _Bhanucandraganicarita_ is rightly considered to be part of the larger project of understanding, as Allison Busch put it, “a more nuanced, layered historiography of early modern India.”
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Notes

1. Following Allison Busch’s “Anxiety of Innovation,” published in this same journal in 2004, I forgo diacritics.
2. The _Bhanucandraganicarita_ is not, however, the last Sanskrit text to focus specifically on the Mughals (see, e.g., Laksmipati’s _Nṛpatinī-garbhītavṛtta_ and _Abdullacaritā_, both edited by J. B. Chaudhuri and published by Pracayanī).
4. On the Tapa Gaccha generally, see Dundas, _Jains_, 142–45.
5. Truschke, _Culture of Encounters_, 167, table 5.1.
7. The beginning of book 2 features a section on Bhanucandra’s lineage, a standard part of Jain biographies. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandra-

8. I discuss the tradition of Sanskrit histories on Indo-Muslim rule in Truschke, _Language of History_.

9. The major exception is a series of Kashmiri chronicles; namely, the _Rajatarangini_ of Srvana (1486), Prajyabhatta (1511, now lost) and Suka (1586), who chronicled Shah Mir’s rule in Kashmir (Suka also covered the Chak dynasty, which succeeded the Shah Mirs).

10. Truschke, _Language of History_, 111. For more on this relationship, also see Vose, “Making of a Medieval Jain Monk,” chap. 4.

11. _Jahangirnama_, 250.

12. See my discussion of other Jain biographies and texts in Truschke, _Culture of Encounters_, chap. 5; and Truschke, _Language of History_, chap. 5.

13. Facsimile of a manuscript folio printed in Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_.


15. Truschke, _Culture of Encounters_, chap. 1.


18. E.g., on the former approach (for other Indo-Persian dynasties), see the fourteenth-century Jain _prabandhas_ and fifteenth-century Kashmiri _rajataranginis_. Truschke, _Language of History_, chap. 4. The _Hirasaubhagya_ section on debating Islam’s merits offers an example (albeit with a different emphasis) of the latter approach. Dundas, “Jain Perceptions of Islam.”

19. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_, 1.7–13; these verses are metrically more complex than those that follow. Verses 1.9, 1.11, and 1.12 explicitly mention Bhanucandra’s time in Mughal contexts.


21. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_, 1.54.

22. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_, 1.65.


27. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_, 1.68–71.


30. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_, 1.77.

31. Siddhicandra, _Bhanucandraganicarita_, 2.58–60. It is unclear whether Siddhicandra intends to refer to Haribhadra’s _Saddarsana-
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