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Preface

When, in 2006, the editor-in-chief of the Clay Sanskrit Library extended the honourable invitation to me to translate Jonarāja’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī together with Śrīvara’s Zaynatarāṅgiṇī from Sanskrit into English for a single volume edition, I was happy to accept the offer and set to work immediately. It was understood that Srikanth Kaul’s editions should serve as the basis for the translation of both works. A time-consuming preparation of two new critical editions was out of the question. Given the constrained time limits of one year for Jonarāja and another one for completing Śrīvara’s Zaynatarāṅgiṇī, an added editorial task would have been impossible to achieve. It was not foreseeable at that moment that the days of the Clay Sanskrit Library were soon to be over. And so it happened that even though the requested translation of Jonarāja had been submitted punctually in the fall of 2007 – Śrīvara was to follow within one year –, the collapse of the CSL initiative necessitated the cancellation of all earlier agreements in the spring of 2008, which resulted in the termination of many an ongoing translation – among them the Zaynatarāṅgiṇī and in its wake Jonarāja’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī too, as this one by itself alone would have made up only half of the originally planned single volume. The publication programme of the ambitious Clay Sanskrit Library expired eventually in the summer of 2009.

In hindsight, one might consider the unfortunate event a stroke of luck, at least with reference to Jonarāja and Śrīvara. For not only have a good number of manuscripts, which had remained unknown to Srikanth Kaul, come to my notice since, but also did the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and the University of Halle grant me several research sabbaticals and funds enabling me to revisit the valley of Kaśmīr repeatedly over the past ten years and – in particular in 2009, 2011 and 2013 – to put my focus almost exclusively on the identification of locations referred to by Jonarāja and by Śrīvara in his Zaynatarāṅgiṇī. As a result, the present index of toponyms provides the reader, where possible, also with geographic coordinates. Historical sites of central importance were selected for the appended maps drawn up by Nils Harm (Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg).

Owing to exigencies of multifarious pressing obligations I had no choice but to publish Jonarāja upon completion at this time and to postpone Śrīvara to a later date. The present edition of Jonarāja was prepared mainly from the Śāradā manuscripts that have recently emerged, taking into due consideration Kaul’s critically established text and the variants he reports. As a consequence, my previous translation
prepared for the CSL in 2007 had to be adapted to the text of the new edition by submitting it to a thorough revision and providing it with abundant annotations, a comprehensive Rājatarāṅgiṇī research bibliography, complete indices of personal names and toponyms, as well as with maps along with an image of Sulṭān Zayn’s founding stone of his artificial island (Laṅkā) in the Ullola, or Volur Lake.

The finalization of the present book has greatly benefited from support generously offered by colleagues and friends: Heike Franke and Patrick Franke (both Bamberg) helped with transcriptions of Islamic name forms and provided me with their reading and a translation of Zayn’s above-mentioned Persian stone slab inscription; Karl-Heinz Golzio (Bonn) calculated most of the dates given in the Laukika era to the exact day; Peter Stephan (Halle) undertook a formal review of the critical apparatus; Arlo Griffiths (Jakarta) kindly subjected a draft version of the introduction, and Albrecht Wezler (Bargteheide) an earlier version of the text and its translation, to their critical review. Jürgen Hanneder (Marburg) generously checked the final draft of the translation line by line against the edited text and suggested a number of valuable improvements. I feel indeed grateful for his time-consuming friendship service so selflessly rendered. On this occasion, I should also like to extend my thanks to Katrin Einicke (Halle), who has proofread this draft with accustomed accuracy and reliability, as well as to Andreas Pohlus (Halle) for his most effective bibliographic support.

I am particularly beholden to Professor Gaya Charan Tripathi and Dr Advaitavadini Kaul (New Delhi) for supplying me most effectively with important manuscript resources.

This work is dedicated to the memory of the vanished Kaśmīri Pandits.
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Introduction

With the above quotations\textsuperscript{1} aptly epitomizing the leading spirit of late medieval Kaśmīrian rulers as depicted by Jonarāja, the reader should be forewarned: Jonarāja will carry him off into a world greatly differing from the common perception of stereotyped Sanskrit belles-lettres, which promise an experience of pleasure in a fictitiously generated universe of happiness and beauty. The reader will experience this difference not only in terms of the subject matter, i.e., the reporting of historic events in their often gruesome reality, but also in terms of the authorial purpose. As a poet, Jonarāja naturally aimed at ensuring his own literary recognition, but in his capacity as court poet he was supposed to immortalize also his patron. As the author of a Rājataraṅginī – in terms of a literary genre sui generis – Jonarāja would also have sought to provide a guideline for balanced sovereignty while at the same time hoping to effect the sensitive reader’s disenchantment with the world by allowing him a taste of kingship as it really was.

\textsuperscript{1} RV 1.40.4b; 9.66.7c; JRT 299cd; ŚRT 3.93d; Rudyard Kipling, The Ballad of the King’s Jest, stanza 5. In: Departmental Ditties and Barrack Room Ballads. Lahore 1886; Stephen Crane, War is kind. In: War is kind and other lines. New York 1899.
1 Jonarāja

The little we know about Jonarāja derives partly from his own self-references and partly from occasional disclosures made by his disciple Śrīvara. It may be summarized as follows: Jonarāja was the grandson of a certain Laularāja, who had a son called Nonarāja, Jonarāja’s father. Nonarāja was defrauded when still in his infancy, on account of which the family lost their property inherited from Laularāja. Eventually, Sulṭān Zayn al-ʿĀbidin had the stolen land returned to his court poet Jonarāja, Nonarāja’s son, by a public exposure of the forgery of the deed.

Jonarāja’s year of birth may be estimated as c. AD 1389, when Sikandar Šāh had risen to power. Śrīvara recorded the year of his death in the following words:

While working on his chronicle of kings, the celebrated Jonarāja, a man of learning, attained the union with Śiva in AD 1459.

Forty-six years later, on 18 April 1505, the date of the prologue to his Kathākautuka, Śrīvara still remembers Jonarāja with warm words. He refers to his deceased teacher (guru) as Paṇḍita Jonaka and etymologizes the name – in line with two self-references

---

2 JRT 7; 391; 766f; 805; 808. Cp. also the introduction to his commentary on the Śrīkaṇṭhacarita, where Jonarāja reveals corresponding personal details: śrīLolarājasutapāṇḍitaḥNonarājitmaṇḍaḥ sahṛdayaḥ vihitābhyanuṣṭaḥ | kāvye Purāricarite kurute ‘bhuyogāṃ vācyārthamātraVivṛtiṃ prati Jonarājaḥ || ŠKC(V) [2]. Basically identical genealogical information with only slight variations caused by the numbering of the respective chapters is given in the colophon(s) concluding his commentary on the Pṛthvīrājavijaya, e.g.: śrīLolarājasutapāṇḍitaḥNonarājitmaṇḍaḥ Viśvarājanāṃ vyaḥhitādyaṣaṅge | ajñām avāpya vidusṣāṃ kila Jonarājaḥ Pṛthinahendravijayābhidhakāvyarājye || PRV(V) 29, 10–13. For Jonarāja’s introductory stanzas to his commentary on the Kirātārjunīya, written in AD 1448/49, cp. below, fn. 50 of this introduction. From what we may take as a subhāṣita from his pen it appears that Jonarāja, as it was not uncommon with the Brahmins of Kaśmīr, would not have been averse to the taste of meat: kaṣṭena yasya sucirād upatiṣṭhate ‘nnaṃ, māṃsapṛhā bhavati tasya hi hāsahetuḥ || ŚKC(V) [3cd]. For a more general appreciation of meat in India, cp. another subhāṣita: annād aṣṭaguṇaṃ piṣṭaṃ piṣṭād aṣṭaguṇaṃ payaḥ | payaḥ ‘ṣṭaguṇaṃ māṃsāṃ māṃsād aṣṭaguṇaṃ ghrām (LUDWIG STERNBACH, Cāṇakya-Niti-Text-Tradition, Vol. 2, Part 2, Cāṇakya’s Six Versions of Maxims: An attempt to reconstruct the Ur-text, Hoshiarpur 1967: 38, no. 65 [written communication by Roland Steiner, 11 July 2012]).

3 ŚRT 1.1. 5–8; 16; 1.5, 2. cp. OROCK 2013: 222ff.


5 ŠRT 1.1. 6.

6 The Kathākautuka is Śrīvara’s Sanskrit translation of Jāmī’s (AD 1414–1492) Persian poem Yūsuf u Zulayḥā. ZUTSCH thinks that Zayn al-ʿĀbidin would have commissioned Śrīvara’s translation (2013: 203, n. 5). It should however be brought to mind that Jāmī wrote his poem in AD 1483, 13 years after Sulṭān Zayn’s demise in 1470, and that Śrīvara translated it in AD 1505, even 35 years after the Sulṭān’s death. Her claim does not seem to be particularly well-founded, let alone defensible. For details regarding the date of Śrīvara’s rendition, see ŠLAE 2012b: 35f, n. 14.

7 KK 40–45.
made elsewhere by Jonarāja himself—as Jyotsnākara (‘moon’), possibly interpreting the name of Jona-rāja according to a contemporary understanding.

Commissioned by Sulṭān Zayn al-ʿĀbidin to carry on Kalhaṇa’s Rājataraṅgiṇī, Jonarāja began to compose his continuation when the Sulṭān was in the heyday of his power. The period reviewed by him follows on the one covered by Kalhaṇa, who had treated the succession of Kaśmīrian rulers as far as the reign of Jayasimha (AD 1128–1155) up to the year 1150. Jonarāja continues from AD 1148, initially writing in retrospect. After having bridged a historical gap of some 250 years, his writing gradually turns into contemporary history. There is some likelihood that he had been eyewitness to the events recorded from at least the final regnal years of Sikandar Šāh (1389–1413). The treatment of the last three rulers, Sikandar Šāh and his sons ʿAlī Šāh and Zayn al-ʿĀbidin, covers almost half of his Rājataraṅgiṇī (JRT 538–976). This is telling considering the fact that the preceding twenty rulers occupy roughly equal space, and mirrors in a way the increasing density and wealth of detail in the latter half of Kalhaṇa’s chronicle. Jonarāja’s accounts of the Islamization of Kaśmīr and of the first systematic Hindu persecutions under Sikandar are accordingly depicted in a comparatively detailed manner. Towards the very end of his chronicle, which abruptly breaks off in 1459, eleven years before Zayn’s death, Jonarāja portrays the Sulṭān as bereft of happiness, having seen dear relatives and many of his trusted followers decease and consequently finding himself in a growing state of isolation.

8 … mayā paṇḍitaJonakākhyaṃ natvā gurum paṇḍitaŠrivareṇa l (KK 40ab); gurur Jyotsnākarākhyo me satatam vāksudākaraḥ āśtīl ... (KK 45 a–c). In three almost identical closing stanzas of his commentary on the Prthvīrājavijaya, Jonarāja, too, refers to himself alternately by Jyotsnā, Jyotsnākara and Jonarāja, cp. PRV(V) 190, 13 (jyotsnākara); 211, 11 (jonarāja); 291, 6 (jyotsnā).

9 In fact, the first element jona-, when taken as related to the middle-indic form joṇa-, would represent skt. yavana-. However, taken as related to mi. joṇhā-, should the dental nasal indeed count little, the missing aspirate and the short vowel even less, jona- could possibly have been considered to actually correspond to skt. jyotsnā, cp. PSM s.v. joṇa and joṇhā. Note that in the instances cited in the footnote above Jonarāja adds his patronym lāvaṇi, “descendant of Lavaṇa,” a formation in accordance with Pāṇ 4.1.95 applied elsewhere by him as the derivation kālhaṇi (“descendant of Kalhaṇa”, JRT 99). Skt. lāvaṇa corresponds—among others—to middle-indic nūna, nona (PSM s.v. lāvaṇa), which is the name of Jonarāja’s father (above, footnote 2). Cp. also Elmslie 1872 s.v. nun, Grierson, vol. 3, s.v. nuṇar [lavaṇāsvādatā] and Hindī nūn°/non°/lon°.

10 Cp. JRT 10–12.
11 Stein 1900, 1: 42.
12 See note on JRT 5.
13 “Kalhaṇa’s narrative of the half century of Kaśmīr history, which lies between the fall of Harṣa [AD 1101, W.S.] and the date of the composition of the chronicle, fills not less than 3449 Ślokas and thus forms close on one-half of the whole work. […] The advantages of this lengthy treatment […] lie chiefly in the authenticity and ample detail of the picture which Kalhaṇa has given us here of contemporary Kaśmīr in its political and social aspects.” (Stein 1900, 1: 117).
2 The Character of Jonarāja’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī

Jonarāja clearly took Kalhaṇa’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī as the model for his chronicle and for that reason he wrote in line with the first Rājatarāṅgiṇī ever composed. The general character of the latter was novel in that Kalhaṇa broke with the form, the accepted practice prevailing until his time, of documenting the history of political events in the literary form of simple annals (vaṃśāvalīs). In his introduction, Kalhaṇa reflects on the progress he had made compared to his predecessors:

What skill would that be, if an event – noted down earlier as life stories of their rulers as witnessed in each case by those who now have passed away – was merely completed with current episodes added to their works?\(^\text{14}\)

The deficiency pointed out by Kalhaṇa, as emphasized by italics in the above translation, is the ‘historical practice’ of contemporary annalists of continuing already existing annals by merely updating them with the latest events. Kalhaṇa had something different in mind when he set about writing history by using poetic means of expression,\(^\text{15}\) as he was seeking to achieve also transcendental aims by activating the sentiment (rasa) of equanimity (śānta).\(^\text{16}\) On the textual surface, the subject matter of his Rājatarāṅgiṇī was the ongoing struggle for power and the resulting mundane delight of independently ruling kings. Those kings he provided with a context, embedding their personalities in the causal connection of their lives and times, thereby drawing character portrayals in the true sense of the word. At the same time they can pass as literary masterpieces, if one only thinks of Kalhaṇa’s representation of King Harṣa’s rise and fall (r. 1089–1101).\(^\text{17}\) Closely related to the circumstances rulers found

---

\(^{14}\) *Drśaṃ drśaṃ nṛpodantaṃ baddhoḍa pramayo iyusām | arvākkālabhavaiv vārtā yat prabandheṣu pūryate ||

\(^{15}\) Slaje 2008a: 223 (“essential blend of writing history by lending it vivid poetic expression”); cp. also Slaje 2008b. On this occasion it deserves perhaps to be noted that the first explicit mention of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī (“Rajatarandschini”) in European literature apparently occurs in a work of FRIEDRICH MAJER (1798, 2: 109), a quite productive Oriental German scholar from Weimar (written communication by Dr. Reinhold Grünendahl, 24 October 2011). On recent attempts to fathom new perspectives on Kalhaṇa and his work, cp. BRONNER (2013); COX (2013); McCREA (2013); SHULMAN (2013).

\(^{16}\) Investigations pursued in Slaje 2008a and 2008b have resulted in the view that Kalhaṇa’s and his successors’ works cannot be subjected to mutually exclusive categorial differentiations such as either ‘history’ or ‘poetry’, but that Kalhaṇa had indeed created a new genre of literature, which in a way is comprehensive of, but on the other hand also transgressing, this notional dichotomy alternately imputed on the Rājatarāṅgiṇī by 19th and 20th century European scholarship: “[…] reliable historiography may even come guised in poetry, inspired by soteriological purposes.” (Slaje 2008a: 239). From the angle of a different approach, BRONNER has come to a confirming conclusion, namely “that this either-or dilemma is false and that a both-and approach to the RT holds far more promise.” (2013: 175).

themselves in is the other side of the coin, their transitory nature, which the poet deliberately made use of. It was concomitant with the success rulers had been striving after. For the majority of kings the painful experience of losing what had been gained by hard toil was inescapable. They could never rest assured in their power, and their fall was predictable at a certain point. To the best of his ability, Kalhaṇa availed himself of historical facts and tried to make the rulers’ lives, together with the accompanying events, poetically comprehensible for his sensitive readers as if these were happening before their eyes. He elaborately transformed real, and for the most part tragic, events of the past into words of touching poetry. One pivotal characteristic of this innovative historical poetry is – according to Kalhaṇa’s claim – the ensured authentic nature (yathāihūtam) of his Rājataraṅgiṇī, on the basis of which it unfolds emotional – and ultimately liberating – effects. It was Bhāmaha, and later also Abhinavagupta, who had extended the purpose of poetry to encompass religious aims as well, but without abandoning its pleasant side effects. 18 Kalhaṇa must have shared quite a similar opinion. In depicting the actual fates and deeds of the kings, he employed suitable suggestive expression (dhvani) productive of the sentiment (rasa) of equanimity (śānta), an emotion which the implausible is incapable of provoking in an equal manner.

Abhinavagupta and Ānandavardhana had also emphasized the predominance of śāntarasa in the Mahābhārata, a work which, for them no less than for Bāṇa, stood in the front rank of poetry (kāvya).19 In their eyes, reading the Mahābhārata would

---

18 dharmārthakāmamokṣeṣu vaicakṣaṇyaṃ kalāṣu ca | prītim karoti kīrtiṃ ca sādhukāivyamānbandhanam || Kāvyalākāra I 12. “Study of good poetry confers fame and pleasure, as well as skill in dharma, artha, kāma and mokṣa, and skill, too, in the fine arts. Nevertheless, pleasure is the main thing.” (MASSON 1969: 54f; see also 77, n. 4). Abhinavagupta preferred the religiously connoted term ānanda to prīti (MASSON 1969: XVII, put into perspective by GEROW 1972: 83, n. 10). Cp. also the account Abhinavagupta has left us of Bhaṭṭanāyaka’s stance: bhāvite ca rase tasya bhogah. […] “nijacitsoabhāvañyatvitvārśāntilakṣaṇaḥ paraabrahmāśāśāsadacitāḥ” (DhĀL 68, 16–18) “Once a rasa has been thus realized, its enjoyment (bhoga) is possible. […] like the bliss that comes from realizing [one’s identity] with the highest brahman, for it consists of repose in emotional detachment (nivṛti) which is the true nature of one’s own self […]” (Following INCALLIS 1990: 222 and JACOB 2010 “Ruyyaka’s Alanākārasarvasva” (publ. 1902]): 203f, n. 5). Note that Abhinavagupta’s views on śānta “were modelled on those of two of his predecessors, Bhaṭṭa-tauta and Bhaṭṭa-nāyaka. […] Abhinava’s originality in this particular respect is at least open to question” (GEROW 1972: 81). Cp. SLAJE 2008a: 223f, n. 62; 237, n. 100.

19 “[…] Ānanda and following him, Abhinava, insist on the overwhelming experience that reading the Mahābhārata provides. As unhappiness and doom succeed one another in seemingly endless display of the vanity of this world; […] the reader is invaded by a sense of doom, […] and he is eventually instilled with a craving for tranquillity […] śāntarasa. The Mahābhārata remains for Sanskrit literary critics the supreme example of this mood, this imaginative creation” (MASSON 1969: X). “The claim was made by Kalhaṇa at the beginning of his Rājataraṅgiṇī that his work on history contains śāntarasa” (MASSON 1969: XIII). Apart from the positive assessment of the theorists just cited, a remarkable obsession with the Mahābhārata can also be observed with other outstanding poets such as Bāṇa. He paid homage to Vyāsa in the first place and praised him, as a creative poet, for having composed the Mahābhārata: namaḥ sarvavide tasmai cyātaya karveśhase | cakre puṣyam sarasvatyaḥ yo varṣam iha bhavatam || HC 3. For details, see SLAJE 2008a: 227 ff, notes 73ff. For a fresh investigation into this matter, cp. MccREA 2013.
inevitably lead to world-weariness (vairāgya), the ultimate cause of equanimity, which was recognized as a precondition for attaining release (mokṣa). In his Locana, Abhinavagupta remarks,

Suffice it to say that as the rasa of peace leads to mokṣa, which is the highest aim of man, it is the most important of all the rasas.

The Rājataṅgiṇī, too, is a war book with considerable recourse to the Mahābhārata.

Moreover, when Kalhaṇa emphasized that his Rājataṅgiṇī was characterized by a dominant sentiment (rasa), he was establishing a theoretical concordance with both Dhvani theorists and his contemporary Maṅkha. The latter – and this is supported by his commentator Jonarāja, Kalhaṇa’s successor in the profession of history writing – held that a composition lacking a dominant sentiment would deserve no supremacy over other poetical works. Both the Mahābhārata and the Rājataṅgiṇī share as their common subject the transitory (kṣaṇaihāva) nature of life and luck and the moral depreciation of even mighty kings. Another of Kalhaṇa’s successors, Śrīvara, expresses exactly this view when he says:

Will there be anybody in whom the present ‘Flow of the Succession of Kings’ would not engender disillusionment by the vicissitudes [of the] rise and fall of the rulers, witnessed [by me] with my own eyes and [so] remembered?

Precisely this nature of historical ‘truth poetry’ as practised by Kalhaṇa, is essential to the literary category of Rājataṅgiṇīs as such and is therefore of fundamental importance also for the present matter. The term ‘history’, when applied to Kalhaṇa’s and the subsequent Rājataṅgiṇīs, properly relates to a poetical, yet faithful depiction of rulers, their lives, and the circumstances surrounding them. Without exception,
the authors of Rājatarāṅgiṇīs emphasize the attempted reliability and adequacy of their accounts. At least they had the explicit intention of making true events and the rulers’ biographies the subject of their literary work. If this was accompanied by a critical awareness of accepted limitations due to the potentially questionable reliability of their sources, is another matter.

This character is fully congruent with the title of their works, if we understand taraṅgiṇī to be suggestive of emotional flow. The primary meaning of Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī is a ‘stream of rulers’. The sense of emotional flow, however, would allude to a “Taste of Kings”, which the sensitive reader is invited to experience himself as the “Flow of the Succession of Kings” as the suggestive meaning of “Rājatarāṅgiṇī”. The continuity inherent in the notion of a stream not only extends to individual kings who manifest themselves as continually surging and subsiding waves whose essential nature is calm (śānta) water, but also to a Rājatarāṅgiṇī composition as such, insofar as it represents a coherent account of events and interrelationships of rulers in absolute power.

Implausibility would be incompatible with the basic character of a Rājatarāṅgiṇī as a genre, which accordingly holds true for Jonarāja’s work, too; this fact adds significantly to the trustworthiness of his accounts. Wherever factual claims can empirically be verified, what Jonarāja states as a witness of the times can generally be proved to be true, and this applies to Śrīvara as well. It is a different matter, of course, and indeed a more delicate one, when it comes to character portrayals of individuals, as these are generally not verifiable in an objective manner. Any reader may however see for himself that Jonarāja depicted whatever weakness, be it moral, mental or physical, he thought to have identified in any Hindu or Muslim individual, in a remarkably unaffected and balanced manner. The probable background for such a representation deserves perhaps a brief digression:

For the Dhvani theorists, disenchantment with the world (vairāgya) was the basic emotion (sthāyyihāva) behind the sentiment of equanimity (śāntarasa). Kalhaṇa had demanded such impartiality (stheyā) from the brilliant poet. He had had prominent predecessors in this regard. Earlier, Bāṇa, in introducing his Harṣacarita, whose subject is historical and whose expression is poetical – which reminds one in a way of the Rājatarāṅgiṇīs –, characterised the poor poet as one with a view obscured by affections.

26 Slaie 2004: 15–22; 2005a: 28–42; 2012b. The same may presumably be claimed for Śuka (ŚuRT), who continued the Kaśmirian rulers’ histories from Fatḥ Šāh in 1486.
27 For details, see Slaie 2008a: 224ff.
28 Ingalls 1990: 479.
29 “Disposing of [this] good quality the [brilliant poet] alone indeed deserves praise, whose speech, on giving an account of past matters, refrains from affection and dislike, as [would that] of an impartial [person].” (ślāghyaḥ sa eva guṇavān rāgadeśābhiḥśrītā | bhūtārthaḥkathāne yasya stheyasyeva sarasvatī || RT 1.7), cp. also below, fn. 34.
(rāgādhiṣṭhitadṛṣṭi). This is all the more important as Ānandavardhana, too, had unambiguously expressed the opinion that the sentiment (rasa) of a literary piece reflects the mood of its originator, who is the poet. The relationship expressed here is clearly that of a detached poet and his literary product, which is imbued with the sentiment of its author. There is more and even earlier evidence than Ānandavardhana, which casts light on Kalhaṇa’s likely understanding of a detached poet. It differs entirely from our conventional notion of an objective historian. A Nāṭyaśāstra passage defines the calm state of śānta exactly in the context of rasa:

The sentiment (rasa) known as calm (śānta) is impartial towards all beings. In it, there is no pain, no pleasure, no hate, nor even envy.

From this it would follow that the creation of equanimity as the leading sentiment of a work was feasible only on the precondition that its author had previously experienced, or was actually in, the very mood of detachment. It would be difficult to create something beyond one’s own experience and emotional state. Therefore, Kalhaṇa proudly described his composition as the culmination of the sentiment of equanimity (śāntarasa):

Recalling the sudden appearance of living beings lasting for a moment only, [the reader] is invited to examine in this [work of mine the poetical] coronation of the calm sentiment.

Compared to Kalhaṇa, there is certainly nothing novel in Jonarāja in terms of his mastery of the literary category and the basic arrangement of his work as a chronologically structured narration in the above sense. He not only does not claim any superiority over his predecessor, but seems to adopt the latter’s opinion of what constitutes a great poet, namely one,

[…] whose speech, on giving an account of past matters, refrains from affection and dislike, as would that of an impartial person (RT 1.7).
when he – as if anticipating posthumous criticism, but actually bringing a hyperbolic twist to bear – reflects on the judgement of his future readers with the prediction that our portrayal of the [Sulṭān’s] heroism, superhuman when the occasion presented itself, is [likely to be mis]taken as flattery by future generations (JRT 391).

Setting himself to write the history of the three centuries of Kaśmīrian rule that had elapsed, Jonarāja, in his introduction, presents himself aptly as Kalhaṇa’s follower on the path of historical poetry:

[So] let my [modest] words be savoured, [too], as they have merged into Kalhaṇa’s poetry!

Is not water from reed, trickling into a stream, drunk [as well]? (JRT 26).36

He evidently did not share everything with his readership. We know from Śrīvara, who worked certain events into his subsequent chronicles, that Jonarāja’s information policy was in places selective. It remains however unclear to what extent Śrīvara actually fulfilled his promise to reveal it. Unlike Kalhaṇa and Jonarāja, Śrīvara structured his Zaynatararāngini38 essentially by chapters according to subject matter, the chronological order of events being relegated to a subordinate level. Luther Obrock convincingly argues that Śrīvara had moreover deliberately introduced a terminological shift from Kalhaṇa’s sāntarasa to another soteriologically significant term – vairāgya40 –, by which Śrīvara established a deep relationship with an influential medieval Kashmīri text, the Mokṣopāya (“The Means to Liberation”) – a text that is intimately tied to kingship41 and is referred to at key moments in Śrīvara’s own narrative.42

35 “Since then [= Kalhaṇa, W. S.], not a single poet had revived the rulers following [Jayasimha] with [his] writings’ nectar of immortality. […] Now that the glorious Zayn al-‘Ābidīn rules [this] territory in an unsathed manner, [I], bearing the name of Jonarāja, am prepared to relate their life stories.” (JRT 6f).

36 This is an allusion to Kalhaṇa and his “drinking” metaphor relating to rasa-poetry: “Now let this Flow of the Succession of Kings be drunk in distinctly through your shell-shaped ears, where the unimpeded flow of the sentiment of [equanimity lends it its] beauty” (tad amandarasasyandasundarīyaṃ nipīyatām | śrotraśuktipuṭaiḥ spaṣṭam aṅga rājataraṅgiṇī || RT 1.24). Cp. on this passage Ślaje 2008a: 229; 2008b: 327.

37 kenāpi hetuṇa tena proktan maḍgurunā na yat | taccheśavartiniṭṇ vātin karisgāmi yathāmani || ŚRT 1.1. 16.

“To the best of my knowledge I shall bring up what remains to be told of what my teacher – for unexplained reasons – had avoided mentioning.”

38 The Zaynatararāngini corresponds to the first two books of the published Rājatararāngini edition of Śrīvara (ŚRT), cp. Ślaje 2005b.

39 Obrock 2013: 225.

40 ŚRT 1.1. 18 (cp. above, n. 23); 3.4.


42 Obrock 2013: 229ff. According to Obrock, Śrīvara’s use of the word vairāgya with its clear aestheticic resonances is intended to stand in for Kalhaṇa’s sānta while adding the salvific and religious valences given to vairāgya by the Mokṣopāya. He regards this shift in terminology as significant, since rasa words are almost universally recognizable in premodern Sanskrit literary discourse, and thus can help unpack the mechanics of the Zaynatararāngini’s complex relationship with the poetics of the present and the inherited Kalhaṇa-based historiography. To Obrock, the term vairāgya on the one
The actual course of the rulers’ fates, their character and actions, provided an ideal basis for suitable emotional responses on the part of the intended audience. Rājataraṅgiṇīs are therefore intrinsically different from the category of eulogies (praśasti), which do not intend to create a calm sentiment, and which are also in no way bound to represent faithfully the real lives of rulers, which are unavoidably tragic in the majority of cases, a fact that can be judged from the course of events in the Rājataraṅgiṇīs. As eulogies do not intend to create a calm sentiment, they are not in the same way bound to represent the real lives of rulers faithfully as are Rājataraṅgiṇīs. Unlike Rājataraṅgiṇīs they also lack the potential for bringing out the tragic aspects of their times. There is a difference between the realism that characterises Rājataraṅgiṇīs and the representation of kings according to panegyric conventions (stuti, praśasti). Despite this difference of content the Rājataraṅgiṇīs remain representatives of Sanskrit poetry, and owing to their nature there is every reason not to discard their records rashly as fictitious narratives. From this point of view it is hoped that the present edition, accompanied as it is by a translation, will stimulate a reassessment of Jonarāja’s work, consigned to oblivion if not disdain by current scholarship.

As a passing note on Jonarāja’s usage it deserves to be remarked that he displays a predilection for – in the misjudging words of Whitney: “a wholly barbarous combination of” – the suffix of comparison -tarām added to personal forms of verbs, for expressing causative meanings in the preterite by using the reduplicated aorist and

hand establishes a link to rasa-based aesthetic conceptions utilized by authors like Kalhana and on the other hand looks at the same time to other texts, specifically the Moksopāya, to give shape to Śrīvara’s imagination of the life of Zayn, who was deeply influenced by the latter work.

43 ‘Tragedy’, as a form of drama (dṛṣya kāvya), may indeed be absent from Sanskrit literature. The same cannot be maintained with equal certainty with reference to the human tragedies plotted by reality and animated in the literary form of poetry (śrāvya kāvya) by the authors of the Rājataraṅgiṇīs. Apart from the issue of authorial intentions in this realm of India’s literary universe, the facticity inherent in the Rājataraṅgiṇī category of poetry bears more impact on the local political discussion at present than scholars seem to be willing to take note of, let alone to accept as relevant. It should however be clarified that the Rājataraṅgiṇīs bear witness also to the existence of a rich pre-Islamic history of Kaśmīr in the cultural context of autochthonous faiths, and to the causes and circumstances accompanying the Islamization of the valley from AD 1339 onward. This is not in conformity with a Jāhilīya perspective on history, a prevailing ideology which seeks to abolish cultural traces of the “period of ignorance” of the past, i.e., the time before the valley had accepted Muslim faith. As the recorded history of Kaśmīr has a significant bearing also on contemporary religious and territorial claims (Slaje 2012a: 26ff), attempts are common to devaluate the historical credibility of the Rājataraṅgiṇīs by classifying them as fairytales of storytellers.

45 On the unfounded exclusion of the follow-up Rājataraṅgiṇīs from the source corpus of Indian history, cp. Slaje 2004: 10 ff; 2005a: 42ff. From the background of the above, it must be left to the judgement of future research to assess the justifiability of the sharp verdict on Jonarāja’s literary merits as “a bland chronicle” and on Śrīvara’s as “an even barer chronicle than its predecessor” (Pollock 2001: 397).

46 Whitney 1889: 176, § 473 c.

47 E. g., agraḥittarām (217), atulayatitarām (110), adṛkṣittarām (410), abhūttarām (544), uddyotetatarām (728), kuṇṭhayantutarām (507), nyagrahītitarām (657), prayacchatitarām (916), vartetarām (701), samacararantarām (408) etc.
for – to us – rather rare aorist forms. Jonarāja’s work – and Pseudo-Jonarāja forms no exception to this observation – contains also words and idiomatic expressions, which are not recorded in our dictionaries, or are attested there only with reference to their occurrence in medieval Sanskrit glossaries (kośas).

Three additional works from Jonarāja’s pen preceding his Rājatarangini belong to the category of commentaries. Two of them, one on Maṅkha’s Śrīkaṇṭhacarita [SKC(V)] and another on Jayānaka’s Prthvīrājavijaya [PRV(V)], are published, whereas his commentary on Bhāravi’s Kirātārjunīya, which was composed after his Śrīkaṇṭhacaritavivṛtti, but before the Prthvīrājavijayavivṛtti – as can be seen from the stanzas concluding chapters 7–9 and 11 of his Prthvīrājavijaya commentary –, and which is dated ad 1448/49, is still awaiting its complete publication.

3 The Text of Jonarāja’s Rājatarangini

3.1 Sigla

3.1.1 Published Materials

B The Rājatarangini (Bombay edition 1896), see Bibliography sub RT.

C The Rāja Taranginī (Calcutta edition 1835), see Bibliography sub RT.

KAUL Jonarāja’s Rājatarangini (edited by Srikanth Kaul), see Bibliography sub JRT.

48 E. g., apīpalat (773), apipyat (168), abhyaṇjganaḥ (323), asisrayan (322), asismarat (254; 871), vyāddarat (210) etc. Cox (2013: 136) has noted “a common penchant” [of ‘ślokakatha’ authors including Kalhaṇa] “for employing the aorist tense”.

49 E. g., aihaḷa (418), ṛṭaṇaka (245; 655), ummlaka (257), timsiveda (957), turuṣkadaṇḍa (609), dhāṭī (665), nisptayiṣṇu (651), puṇḍrakāyate (13), mokṣākṣara (656), vakṣasi (/urasi) + √dhā (√vas) = “placing (a woman) on one’s chest, a woman resting on one’s chest” – sexual relationship, forced marriage (169; 303; 416; 757) etc.

50 Ojha (PRV(V), Introd. p. 3) gives its date as ad 1449, and so does Kaul on the basis of a Śrīnagar MS (1967: 33f, note 3). I am grateful to Prof. Harunaga Isaacson (Hamburg) for having kindly shared with me a digitalization of “BORI MS 120/1875–76”, providing an opportunity to briefly check the introductory stanzas, this which contains this date. As the microfilmed folios are in utter disarray, the beginning of Jonarāja’s commentary is to be found only on image no 96: oṃ | prasādagāmihīryamanoramaśrī rasapravāhaṃ madhuraṃ sravantī | sarasvatīvāstv atipuṇyalaihyā sarasvatī | vo malaśodhanāya || [1] || śrīNonarājatanayaḥ kurujiccharatre paryāyamātram aihidhāsyati Jonarājaḥ | kiṃ nāma nāmadamanipraguṇāṃs taḍāko vyākośayaty udadhivat taralāṃs taraṅgān || [2] || śrīJainollāhadenasya sāṃrājye Jonako dvijaḥ | kharṣiviśvamite śāke yathāmati yatiṣyate || [3]. Variant readings collated from Göttingen MS “Vish 1” (digitizations kindly provided by Dr. Reinhold Grünendahl) and from two MSS (“No 54”; “No 189”) deposited in the National Archives, New Delhi (images of their first folios kindly provided by Prof. Arlo Griffiths); 1d vo no (Vish 1); 2a ’tanayah [”tanu jah (No 189); ”charatre] ”caritre (Vish 1; No 54; 189); 2d vyākośayaty vyākośayaty (No 189); vyāko[-]jaty (No 54); 3a ’jainollābhaddenasya] ”jainollābhaddenasya (No 54); kha = 0, ṛṣi = 7, viśva = 13. The year 1370 [written inter lineam in Ms No 54] of the Śaka era corresponds to ad 1448/49, a year that indeed falls in the reign of Zayn al-‘Abidin.
3.1.2 Manuscripts

All sigla used by Kaul for his editions of 1966 (ŚRT; ŠuRT) and 1967 (JRT) have been retained. His published manuscript descriptions (1966: VI-VIII; 1967: 1–9) are not replicated here in detail. New MSS are marked in the descriptive part by an asterisk (*). They were collated from xerox-copies or digitizations provided by the institutions holding the originals.

Sigla of MSS used in the apparatus of the present edition:
– Σ (= all MSS), D, K, Š

Mss collated for the present edition:
– Š

Sigla of MSS containing the texts of Jonarāja (JRT), Pseudo-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT), Śrīvara (ŚRT) and Śuka (ŠuRT).

A Archaeological Department of Jammu and Kaśmīr Government, Śrīnagar. ŚRT, ŠuRT. Devanāgarī script.
Transcribed by Nāth Panḍit from a MS “belonging to Pandit Ganesh Das, Pujāri, of Rudrasandhyā, village Muṇḍä, Tehsīl Anantnag” (Kaul 1966: VI).

D BORI Poona (No 173 of 1875–76, Cat. no. 624). Ps-JRT, ŚRT, ŠuRT. Devanāgarī script.
“Codex unicus of the Devanāgarī recension”, on which edition B is based and “in all probability forms the continuous part of Stein’s MS L of the Rājatarāṃgini of Kalhaṇa”51 (Kaul 1967: 6ff). In spite of this statement the text of B differs occasionally from D. It is not clear if such differences were caused by tacit emendations made by the editor or by influence from another manuscript source.

I1 India Office Library, London (ms no. 2769b–e, Cat. no. 3972). ŚRT, ŠuRT. Devanāgarī script (Kaul 1966: VII).

I2 India Office Library, London (ms no. 1146a–e, Cat. no. 3976). ŚRT, ŠuRT. Devanāgarī script (Kaul 1966: VII).


---

51 On details and on the importance of the now lost MS L[ahore], cp. also Kölver 1971: 25f.


[I₄] India Office Library, London (ms no. 1146, Cat. no. 3975; 3978). ŚRT, ŚuRT. Devanāgarī script. Described by KÖLVER (1971: 29f) under siglum MS I₄/5 (!). Not consulted by KAUL.

[I₅] India Office Library, London (ms no. 2769; Cat. no. 3971; 3973). ŚRT, ŚuRT. Devanāgarī script. Described by KÖLVER (1971: 31f) under siglum MS I₅/7 (!). Not consulted by KAUL.


M Oriental Research Department, Śrīnagar (available only during KAUL’s presence on the spot). Transcript prepared solely with the help of editions B and C by MADHUSŪDAN KAUL. Present whereabouts unknown, cp. KAUL (1967: 2; 8).

Ś₁ BORI Poona (No 172 of 1875–76, Cat. no. 625). JRT 1–836b. Ś₁ formed the basis of KAUL’s edition up to JRT 836b (cp. Ś₀). KAUL (1967: 3f) considered the scribe of this MS to be identical with Ratnakaṇṭha, the famous scribe of M. A. STEIN’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī ms, who was active between AD 1648/49–1685/86.⁵²

Ś₂ BORI Poona (No 171 of 1875–76, Cat. no. 623). JRT complete, ŚRT 1.1,1–3.334a, ŚuRT complete. Dated [Laukika] Saṃvat [49]38 = AD 1862. The date is wrongly given by KAUL (1967: 1) as Vikrama Saṃvat 1938 = AD 1881. Scribe: Rāmacandra, during the reign of Ranbir Singh (r. 30 June 1857 to 12 September 1885). There is some likelihood that this MS represents the continuation of a collective MS described as P₃ (= Kalhaṇa’s RT) by KÖLVER (1971: 41f). In this case it would have been bought by G. BÜHLER in Kaśmīr in 1875/76, who took it with him to Poona. KÖLVER derived MSS P₃ and Gö [= Ś₁₀] of Kalhaṇa’s RT from the same hyparchetype (q). Ś₁₀ breaks off at exactly the same passage (ŚRT 3.334a) as Ś₂.

Ś₃ Oriental Research Department, Śrīnagar, accession no 213. IGNCA MS no 15256. JRT, ŚRT, ŚuRT complete (KAUL 1967: 4f). Four different scribes. Dated Śaka 1785 (= AD 1863).

⁵² STEIN 1900, 1: 46f.
Ś₁ Private Collection, Śrīnagar (Kaul 1967: 5). JRT 411f–976, ŚRT 1.1–1.7, 44. Ś₁ formed the basis of Kaul’s edition from JRT 836c onwards (cp. Ś₂).

Ś₃ Oriental Research Department, Śrīnagar, accession no. 1046-1. IGNCA DS no. 18244. 26 fol., 27 digitized images. JRT 226b–976. Non-anuṣṭubh metres written in purple ink. Another scribal hand commences on fol. 31r [= image 21].

Ś₆ Private Collection (Dr. Shivnāth Sharmā Shāstrī), Śrīnagar. JRT, ŚRT, ŚuRT complete. Scribe: Madhusūdana Pajjyana (Pajun) [see also Kaul 1966, App. C, note on 452]. Ś₆ depends on Ps-JRT (= the Devanāgarī recension represented by B, see description below). “Conflated manuscript owing to the fusion of the Śār. and the Dev. recensions” (Kaul 1967: 6).

Ś₆ The siglum B Ś₆ (only in this sequence!) is used for B Ś₆, as it invariably copies the readings of B in the margin.

Ś₇ Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms Stein Or d 31.ŚRT 1.1–4.654 (Clauson 1912: 598, MS no 122–123). Ś₇ formed the basis of Kaul’s ŚRT edition (Kaul 1966: VI) with copious misreadings and unreported variant readings.

Ś₈ Private Collection (Kaul), Śrīnagar. ŚRT 1.7–IV 656.

Ś₉ Oriental Research Department, Śrīnagar, MS no. 2457. JRT 448b–976; ŚRT 1.1–3.334 a. Collective manuscript, consisting of three originally independent fragmentary MSS (secondary page numbers added by a European hand). Conservative representation of upadhmāṇīya, jihvāmūliya, and assimilation of visarga to sibilants. Digitized images.


---

53 For the Kalhaṇa fragment forming part of it, cp. Kölver 1971: 35ff [O₃].
siglum Gö). For the stemmatic affiliation of Kalhana’s text see KÖLVER, p. 55 and cp. Š. above. Digitized images.

Colophon: iti śrīpaṇḍitanorājasūnoḥ śrījonarājasya kṛtau rājataraṅgiṇiyāṃ pratha-
mas taraṅgaḥ | pūrveṇa saha navamas taraṅgaḥ samāptah || 9 || rājānah 22 | granthaḥ
972 | ādito rājānah 125 | ādito granthaḥ [blank] || śākāṅkṣayomuṣuṇdramiḍadtadacaitra
kṛṣṇāṅkarkanavādavase dhīgatādhīrājye bhūpe satāsarasi śiṃhayute pratāpaye tāṁ nṛpālm
alikhad vibudho mukundah || asyāṁ dvitiyāyāṁ rājataraṅgiṇiyāṁ samatītarājasaṃkhyā
citryate: 1 jayasinḥaputraḥ paramāṇuḥ | 2 vattidevaḥ | 3 voḍadevaḥ | 4 jassadevaḥ
| 5 jagadevaḥ | 6 rājadevaḥ | 7 saṅgrāmadevaḥ | 8 rāmadevaḥ | 9 laṁkṣadevaḥ | 10
sinḥadevaḥ | 11 sūhadevaḥ | 12 ričanaḥ | 13 udayanadevaḥ | 14 koṭā | 15 śamsadīnaḥ |
| 16 jyamsīraḥ | 17 alabhadīnaḥ | 18 śāhabhadīnaḥ | 19 kuddadīnaḥ | 20 sekandharah | 21
āliśāhaḥ | 22 jainollāhadīnaḥ

JRT 1–976 (fol. 232 to fol. 256 / image 479 to image 527)
ŚRT 1.1,1–3.334a (fol. 257 to fol. 295 / image 529 to image 605)

*S11 National Archives, New Delhi. JRT, ŚRT, SuRT. Ms no. 137. Śāradā, 108 foll.

PDF-File.
This is an epitome in prose by an anonymous author, in all likelihood by Sāhibrām († 1872).54 In terms of contents it covers JRT 1–975 (foll. 1v–25v; PDF images 122–148), ŚRT (foll. 26r–82v; PDF images 148–203) and SuRT (foll. 82v–108v [KAUL, App. C, 452 (= B 950), which, according to some MSS in KAUL’s apparatus, would mark the end of Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājataraṅgiṇī]; PDF images 203–230).
The author summarizes in prose the events poetically depicted in the three Rājataraṅgiṇīs. His narration is interspersed with quotations from the original works, in the case of JRT at the end in particular. The dating stanzas concluding each reign are cited verbatim. Variants occurring in citations clearly recognizable as such will be found reported in the critical apparatus. The text is identical with the copy of a manuscript from the Bodleian not traceable in CLAUSSON’S Catalogue (1912), but obviously forming part of the bundle of accounts ascribed to Sāhibrām (Ms numbers Stein 129–130). The xerox-copy in my possession shows a note from Stein’s pen: “Pt Sahibram’s Abstract of the later Chronicles (incomplete). Copied June 1891 from Poona MS 1875/76, No. 178.”

54 I am grateful to Anett Krause, who drew my attention to this likely authorship (written communication, 3 February 2012). On Pt. Sāhibrām, a contemporary of Mahārāja Raṇbīr Singh (1830–1885) and the father of Pt. Dāmodara († 1892), who composed the Pañcamī Rājataraṅgiṇī (PRT), cp. STEIN 1900, 2: 383ff.
3.2 Strands of Transmission

Two recensions of Jonarāja’s Rājataraṅgiṇī have come down to us, a Śāradā recension (JRT) and an extended Nāgarī recension (Ps-JRT).\(^{55}\)

3.2.1 Pseudo-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT), or revised Nāgarī Recension

The Nāgarī recension is the result of a careful reworking with – historically reliable – additions which continue right into the 16\(^{th}\) century in the form of insertions.\(^{56}\) The Ps-JRT additions are therefore recognizably later than Śrīvara (ŚRT). The Nāgarī recension is a priori under suspicion of a revision, which has also produced variants.

One striking feature of this recension consists in its tendency to replace words for “Brahmin” such as dvija of the JRT-recension by “people” (jana/loka) or “high-minded men” (mahātman), as if with a view to avoiding explicit references to Brahmins forming a social class in their own right. This usage is consistent to such a degree that it gives the strong impression of a systematic editorial replacement.\(^{57}\)

It is possible that this phenomenon mirrors, if not an ideological, at least a certain historical background documenting Bhaṭṭa Sūha’s\(^{58}\) violent efforts over decades to abolish the hereditary social class of the Kaśmīri Brahmins.\(^{59}\)

The Ps-JRT is represented by only one extant MS (D), edited by Peterson (edition B) and re-edited by Kaul. Its variant readings are frequently found in the margin of MS Ś\(^6\)pc as copied from B.

3.2.2 Jonarāja (JRT), or Śāradā Recension

It is possible to discern recensions and MSS families by omissions, corruptions and to a certain extent also by agreements in variant readings. By this criterion, the MSS of the Śāradā recension fall into two larger families,\(^{60}\) which, in accordance with al-
most omnipresent representatives in each, can be designated in abbreviated form as [Ś2/10] and [Ś5/9].

The picture that emerges from the [Ś5/9] group is slightly distorted by the fact that Ś4, Ś5 and Ś9 are incomplete and that their sigla are therefore not evenly distributed over the searchable critical apparatus. Their family affiliation is however beyond any doubt.

The above families are independent of the Ps-JRT or Nāgarī recension insofar as they do not contain any of the latter’s additional and supplementary stanzas. The degree to which the families share variant readings with Ps-JRT differs considerably. This is not surprising, as Ps-JRT is the recension which has drawn fundamentally upon the text of the JRT recension.

[Ś2/10] and [Ś5/9]
In the majority of cases, the [Ś2/10] and the [Ś5/9] families each show readings which are in conflict with the Ps-JRT transmission. This observation also holds true where the nuclear families increase in number to the extent of [Ś2.3.6.10] and [Ś4.5 K].

[Ś2/10]
As regards the relationship of Ś2 and Ś10, Kölver, for the textual part of Kalhaṇa’s RT, which is also part of them, derived MSS P3 [~ Ś2 (?)] and Gö [= Ś10] from one hyperarchetype (Ω). In the subsequent sections containing Śrīvara’s text, which were not investigated by Kölver, Ś10 breaks off at exactly the same point (ŚRT 3.334a) as does Ś2. This adds weight to Kölver’s stemmatic representation of their interdependence (1971: 55). Yet Ś2 and Ś10 do not share scribal errors. In contrast to Ś10, Ś2 is rather prone to scribal mistakes, whereas Ś10 appears to be almost faultless in this regard. In 68c, for example, Ś10 reads correctly °balād deśān mantrībhīr, whereas in Ś2 °d desān° has been dropped, which resulted in the reading °balā mantrībhīr. Instances of this kind, which are not rare (cp. the shared blank in 900d), point indeed to a common hyperarchetype of Ś2 and Ś10 as assumed by Kölver, since in light of the blunders of Ś2, Ś10 can hardly depend directly on it, despite its younger age: Ś2 was written in AD 1862, Ś10 twenty-five years later, in AD 1887. It is however difficult to rule out the possibility that Panḍit Mukunda Rāma, who copied Ś10, tried to improve on his exemplar by emendations made by himself.

A similar picture of intimate family bonds results from purely statistical considerations, which make clear that both the families [Ś2/10] and [Ś5/9] are closely related to each other. A common ancestor for both of them can be inferred from the blanks recension. Throughout the text, it does not show the least acquaintance with any of the variant readings and additions of Pseudo-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT).
and omissions they share (800b; 817a; 828d; 829cd; 831; 842cd; 910cd; 911d; 913a; 922c; 938c, etc.). The number of common blanks and rejected readings increases tremendously from JRT 800 and almost line-wise in particular from JRT 910ff onwards. These blanks are all found to have been completed in the Nāgarī recension (Ps-JRT). In such instances, the Ps-JRT recension presents a corrected and complete text. The only persuasive explanation for the textual condition seems to be the assumption that all extant Śāradā MSS of the JRT recension were directly or indirectly copied from one exemplar the last folios of which were already defective at the time.⁶¹

Common mistakes add further weight to the above assumption, as the following examples unmistakably show:

The [Ś₂/10] and [Ś₅/9] families faithfully transmit juhītu, easily recognizable as a mistake, instead of correct juhotu:

– (784a) juhotu Ś₁.3.6.10 K C D B] juhītu Ś₂.4.9.10 ac

Mistakes in line with the above (misreading of -o- for -ī-), nourish the suspicion that they could have been caused by a misinterpretation of Devanāgarī vocalization diacritics. In Devanāgarī, -o- and -ī- can easily be confounded, which is not the case with the corresponding Śāradā diacritics. There are more examples of this kind, for instance occasional confusions of -gh- with -dh-, or of -bh- with -m-. Typically enough, but not exclusively, in the majority of cases they occur on the last folios of the text, as pointed out above, but unevenly distributed over the two families. An explanation which suggests itself and might be accepted as a working hypothesis would be that the exemplar from which the two families ultimately derive was already a Devanāgarī transcript, or had been conflated by direct or indirect influence of such a one. Although traces of a conflation with misinterpreted Devanāgarī characters are recognizably present in the Śāradā text of JRT, this has no bearing on the basic recensional Śāradā- and Devanāgarī-bifurcation keeping the JRT and the Ps-JRT texts apart.

– (839c) ṣghaṭanāṃ Ś₂–4.6.10 K C D B] ṣdhaṭanāṃ Ś₉
– (939a) ullolaŚ₂.3.10 K C D B Ś₆[p] ullīlaŚ₄.9
– (938d) ārabhyam ārabhe Ś₃.4.9 K D B Ś₆[p] āramyabhrabhē Ś₂.6 ac 10 C

The [Ś₅/9] family is characterized by quite a number of common blanks (e.g., 490d; 519c; 527d; 553b; 559b; 563d; 605b, 719a) and common omissions (e.g., 668–678) as well as by shared orthographic blunders (e.g., 839c; 938c). They abound in common mistakes of different kinds (474, 517, 519, 528, 531, 553, 565, 613, 775, 778, 794f, 798, 893, 925/926 [eyeskip], 934 [misinterpretation]), which establishes their close relationship.

⁶¹ Cp. 928f (ślokaḥ ekaḥ patitaḥ gloss. Ś₃[smim]).
On the following pages, figures in brackets indicate the sum total of common variant readings of more or less self-contained MSS families. The bracketed distribution numbers were extracted from the critical apparatus and have the single purpose of conveying an average statistical idea about their mutual relationship:

Variant readings shared by family [Ś2/10] (sum total = 243):

- [Ś2.10] (138)
- [Ś2.3.10] (36)
- [Ś2.6.10] (26)
- [Ś2.3.6.10] (43)

Variant readings shared by family [Ś5/9] (sum total = 127):

- [Ś4.9] (68)
- [Ś5 K] (22)
- [Ś5.9] (7)
- [Ś5ac9] (6)
- [Ś4.5.9 K] (11)
- [Ś4.5ac9 K] (13)

There is a clear dividing line between the sets of the above variants and those of the Ps-JRT recension (D B Ś6pc):

- (926b) praṇā Ś2–6ac9.10 K C kruddho D B Ś6pc
- (963a) kṛito Ś2–6ac9.10 K C niṣṭo D B Ś6pc
- (519c) ṫimśva niṁva Ś2.3.5pc6.10 C ṭim–niṁva Ś1.4.5ac9 K kīyan naiṇa D B Ś6pc
- (527d) uddhasati yā śriyā Ś2.3.5pc6.10 K C uḷḷuṇṭhaṭa–ṣmi Ś1.5ac uḍḍhayaṭa–ṣmi Ś4.9 uḷḷuṇṭhayati sma yā D B Ś6pc
- (553b) yoddhām vallāmataṁ upāo D B Ś6pc yoddhūṇi baddhodyamam upāo Ś2.3.5pc6.10 C yoddhāva —— upāo Ś1.4.5ac9 K

It is striking that the last three examples show no loss of syllables in the [Ś2/10] and [D B Ś6pc] groups in contrast to those marked by MSS of the [Ś5/9] family. It is a matter of speculation whether this might be due to two independently made attempts by [Ś2/10] and [D B Ś6pc] to fill the gaps, or whether one of the groups has retained the original wording. It is only on account of the established fact that the Ps-JRT text is the result of a revised enlargement that variants of the [Ś2/10] and [Ś5/9] families have been adopted and preferred to [D B Ś6pc] wherever possible, but always only after a careful weighing of their character and meaning.

---

62 These possibilities decrease towards the end of the work, probably due to material damage.
It will be observed that also MSS Š_{1.3.6} K appear occasionally in the company of the above families. Their degree of oscillatory contamination is definitely higher than that of the rather sharply outlined [Ś_{2/10}] and [Ś_{5/9}] families. Thus they seem to have borrowed crosswise from both the [Ś_{2/10}] and [Ś_{5/9}] strands:

- Contamination of MSS Š_{1.3.6} K with family [Ś_{2/10}]: sum total = 46.
- Contamination with families [Ś_{2/10}] and / or [Ś_{5/9}]: sum total = 95.

Up to this point, contamination with Ps-JRT remains conspicuously absent from all the above MSS. Despite being conflated, these MSS, when forming part of any of the above families, would have adopted their readings from a pool belonging exclusively to the JRT recension.

Contamination of the [Ś_{2/10}] family with D (sum total = 32):

- Š_{10} D (12)
- Š_{2.10} D (13)
- Š_{2.6.10} D (7)

Given the evidence for a JRT strand to which the two Šāradā MSS Š_{2.10} clearly belong, it seems likely that in the above cases D has preserved readings from the JRT pool of variants. There is no reason to assume that Š_{2.10} would have borrowed from the Ps-JRT recension.

The picture changes slightly when enlarged families such as Š_{2.3.5 p c 6.10} share variant readings with D. Wherever this occurs, Š_{1} invariably comes into play:

Contamination of the enlarged family [Ś_{2/10}] with Š_{1} and D (sum total = 64):

- Š_{1.2.6.10} D (2)
- Š_{1.3.6.10} D (23)
- Š_{1.3.5.6.10} D (26)
- Š_{1.3.5 p c 6.10} D (13)

Here we may still assume that D might have preserved readings of the JRT-recension as with family [Ś_{2/10}] and other MSS.

The above judgement can hardly apply to those groups in which MSS of the nuclear families [Ś_{2/10}] and [Ś_{5/9}] do not take part, and where only MSS of the [Ś_{1.3.6} K] group blend with D (sum total = 8):

- Š_{1.3} K D (5)
- Š_{1.3.6} D (1)
- Š_{1.3.6} K D (2)

Of particular relevance are instances where Š_{1} alone shares variant readings with D (sum total = 35):
We may therefore assume that Ś₁ forms a connecting link to the Ps-JRT recension. Of all manuscripts this one seems to signify the peak of contamination, as its readings oscillate between single families and even cross recensional boundaries.

In contrast to the above, Kaul had considered Ś₁ the principal representative of the JRT recension and has selected it as basic manuscript for his edition up to JRT 836b, where it breaks off. From v. 836c onwards he used Ś₄ which, however, according to the present analysis, forms part of the [Ś₅/9] family.

4 Conventions and Editorial Principles

The present edition gives Kaul’s apparatus as converted from its original negative to the inferred positive shape. Additional JRT MSS were collated by the present editor. The edition of the supplementary passages of Pseudo-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT) rests entirely on the readings reported in Kaul’s edition as no other manuscript of this recension has emerged so far.

4.1 Abbreviations used in the Critical Apparatus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>(ante correctionem) before correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acln</td>
<td>(ante correctionem legi nequit) before correction, illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acprob</td>
<td>(ante correctionem probabiliter) probably before correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>(coniecit) conjecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>em.</td>
<td>(emendatio) emendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im</td>
<td>(in margine) in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indis</td>
<td>(indistincta) indiscernible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln</td>
<td>(legi nequit) illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pc</td>
<td>(post correctionem) after correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pcm</td>
<td>(post correctionem in margine) after correction, in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pcsm</td>
<td>(post correctionem secunda manu) after correction, by a second hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>(prima manu) by the first hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmim</td>
<td>(prima manu in margine) by the first hand, in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob</td>
<td>(probabiliter) probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td>(secunda manu) by a second hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smim</td>
<td>(secunda manu in margine) by a second hand, in the margin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

64 Kaul 1967: 5.
4.2 Symbols used in the Critical Apparatus

En-dash (–) represents syllable(s) indicated by dashes as missing or illegible by scribes:

(B 327a) kātara° (em. K) | kāra° D | kāra–° B | sākāra° Ś

(297a) sā brāhmanakumārena Š₂,₃,₆₋₁⁰ C | sā——kumārena Š₁₋₁⁰

4.3 Orthography

In accordance with the orthographical conventions generally prevailing in Kaśmīrian Sanskrit manuscripts and meticulously observed by Š, visarga sandhis have been standardized following Pāṇ 8.3.37: visarga (ḥ) appears assimilated to initial sibilants (ś, ṣ, s), as jihvāmūlīya (ḥ) before surd gutturals, and as upadhmānīya (ḥ) before surd labials. With a view to avoiding an inflation of the apparatus by an unnecessary duplication of orthographic inconsistencies, visargas that have been standardized in the text are reproduced in pausa form in the apparatus:

(65a) tataś śrījagadevas
    tataḥ Š₁₋₃,₆₋₁⁰ C D B] latra K

(42a) tau hi svabhṛtyair nissatyau
    niḥsatyau Š₂,₃,₆₋₁⁰ C] nisatyau Š₁ K niḥsattvaṃ D B Š₆₋₁⁰

(158ab) Bhauṭṭebhyaḥ Kāśmīrajana°
    bhauṭṭebhyaḥ Š₁₋₃,₆₋₁⁰ K D] bhottebhyaḥ Š₁₀ C B Š₆₋₁⁰

(77c) aveṣṭayad balaiḥ Padmo
    balaiḥ Š₁₋₃,₆₋₁⁰ C K D B] balaṃ Š₆₋₁⁰

Avagrahas tacitly restored in the text are omitted from the apparatus:

(123c) yo ‘ṣṭādaśa°
    yo ṣṭādaśa° Š₁₋₃,₆₋₁⁰ K C] aṣṭādaśa° D B

Direct speech has been indicated in the edition by using double quotation marks:

“Bhiṣāyako baliṃ yat te grhitvā vyadhitāśiṣaḥ
    nirvighnam bhāvi tvadrājyam” iti tau bhūpam ucatuḥ  ||46||

4.3.1 Scribal Blunders

Clearly recognizable scribal blunders, which are particularly frequent in K and which bear no text-critical relevance, have not been reproduced from Kaul’s edition here.₆₅

₆₅ As, for example, udakṣati° (only K) for udakpati° (381c).
Editorial emendations made in B will also not be found in the apparatus, as they lack a manuscriptal basis. In like manner, unconvincing emendations and corrections as well as erroneous compounding or separation of words by Kaul are not reproduced, but have been tacitly edited in their corrected form:

(Ps-JRT 109 B 928) vinā nivartinyāṃ (Kaul) → vinānivartinyāṃ (present edition)

(JRT 478; Ps-JRT 51 B 558) madendra° (em. Kaul) → māhendra° (present edition)

4.4 Names

4.4.1 Personal Names and Toponyms

Personal names and toponyms are edited with capital initials so as to make them easily recognizable:

\[
tatputro Rājadevo 'tha Kāṣṭhavāṭaṃ bhayād gataḥ
anīnye Vāmapārśvasthair dvāreśasya virodhibhiḥ \quad ||76||
\]

4.4.2 Non-Sanskritic Names

Non-Sanskritic, i.e. generally Muslim, names are represented according to the orthography used by the most reliable manuscript(s), which at the same time show at least a certain consistency – as is especially the case with Ś10 – and seem to be closest to the inferable pronunciation. There are no attempts to be recognized in Jonararāja’s and Śrīvara’s works to sanskritize Muslim personal names except for the sake of occasional punning. Both authors seem to have aimed at an orthographic representation of the authentic phonetic realisation prevailing at their time. Since the writing of these names appears entirely unsystematic in our MSS and does not contain discernible information of any prosopographic value, variant orthographies – except for clearly erroneous spellings – of each particular name are reported in the apparatus only at their very first occurrence, which can be traced by using the name index. After their first occurrence, the standardized form is retained throughout the edited text in order to avoid disorientation on the part of the reader.

4.4.3 Additions and Substitutions (Ps-JRT)

Additional passages of Ps-JRT have been incorporated into the main text after the model of the Bombay edition. Their verse numbers thus correspond ultimately with this edition and are marked with a “B”. They are printed in a smaller font size to make them unmistakably identifiable.
Ps-JRT substitutions of JRT stanzas were assigned to the critical apparatus.

Kaul’s verse numberings have been retained with a view to maintaining the concordance with his edition. This principle applies also to passages, which he had not identified as, and therefore also not marked as, belonging to the Ps-JRT recension.

Kaul’s so-called “Testimonia” were excluded from the present apparatus following his own assessment, according to which two of them (the “Persian Translation” of the Devanāgarī recension and its epitome, the Intiḫāb Tārīḫ-i-Kašmīr) were “not reliable guides” and the third, the Rājatarāṅginīsaṅgraha, was “practically of no use”. Instead, Ś11, a prose Sanskrit epitome of JRT (Śāradā recension) by Śāhibrām, unknown to Kaul, has been utilized for the present edition and analysed for the translation.

4.5 Translation

Except for Dutta’s English paraphrase (1898) and Singh’s Hindi translation (1972), no other rendition of Jonarāja’s text (JRT) has been made available to date, despite its importance for a crucial era in the history of Kašmīr, the transition from Hindu to Muslim rule. Dutta, who based his work on the editio princeps (Calcutta 1835), is, for various reasons expounded elsewhere, completely unsuitable for purposes of research. It would moreover require a combination of refined poetic and scholarly skills to do full translational justice to a challenging work as the present one. Obvious limitations of this kind are all the more true for someone to whom English is not the mother-tongue as in the case of the present author. This is why the current translation had to be content with the dry English prose a German-speaking philologist is

---

66 Cp. Kaul 1967: 19–25. Satoshi Ogura has recently dealt with some ramifications in the transmission of Persian Rājatarāṅginī translations in a fresh and promising manner. His results published in 2011 should however be taken with some caution and as provisional, as two unsettled preconditions beset his paper. The first one is the existence of different recensions of Jonarāja’s Rājatarāṅginī. On p. 24, note 10, Ogura claims that the Devanāgarī recension containing Pseudo-Jonarāja’s additions (Ps-JRT) would have been lost, though it does of course exist and has even been edited twice (JRT ed. Peterson 1896; ed. Kaul 1967). Ogura’s comparison moreover lacks a clear identification of the respective textual versions by implicitly referring to the Śāradā recension (JRT), although Kaul had maintained that the Persian translation would have been based on the Devanāgarī recension (Ps-JRT). Thus it remains unclear what texts exactly Ogura had made the actual basis of the texts he compares. Second, the criteria for differences to be drawn between “texts” or “text-groups” of the Persian translations – all made from Sanskrit “texts” (plural) (pp. 30; 34) – remain opaque. This is particularly so in the case of so-called “Text B” transmitted by at least 3 MSS, but unpublished to date. Under the circumstances, drawing definite conclusions as to their respective authorships seems to be methodically problematic.

67 Kaul 1967: 8f.

68 See Bibliography, sub JRT.

typically capable of. Its main, though not sole, purpose is to make editorial decisions comprehensible by disclosing the understanding of the text by its editor.

The Bombay edition containing about 350 additional stanzas of Pseudo-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT) has never been translated before. In accordance with the layout principles governing the edited text, the present translation prints passages belonging to Pseudo-Jonarāja, marked with “B” (for “Bombay edition”) also in a smaller font size. Ps-JRT substitutions of JRT stanzas assigned to the critical apparatus in the edition are translated in the footnotes.

Depending on the respective usage, words like “Earth”, etc., sometimes appear in the translation with capital initials. The purpose of this convention is, first, to call attention to the fact that the author intended them – often as a pun – as personifications, and, second, to justify the use of English pronouns expressing gender: “The Earth, … she …”

From the time of Muslim rule onwards, and thus beginning with Šams ad-Dīn, “Sulṭān” is invariably used as translation for skt. rājan and the various synonyms thereof. What the terms have in common is the connotation of rulers exercising absolute power over their subjects.
5 Contents in Chronological Order of Rulers

Jonarāja’s Introduction  JRT 1–26

Second Lohara-Dynasty

1) Jayasiṃha (AD 1128–1155), account begins in AD 1148  JRT 27–38
2) Paramāṇuka, Son of Jayasiṃha (AD 1155–1164)  JRT 39–48
3) Vantideva, Son of Paramāṇuka (AD 1164–1171)  JRT 49
4) Voppadeva, of unknown descent (AD 1171–1180)  JRT 50–55
5) Jassaka, Younger Brother of Voppadeva (AD 1180–1199)  JRT 56–64
6) Jagadeva, Son of Jassaka (AD 1199–1213)  JRT 65–75
7) Rājadeva, Son of Jagadeva (AD 1213–1236)  JRT 76–87
8) Saṅgrāmadeva, Son of Rājadeva (AD 1236–1252)  JRT 88–104
9) Rāmadeva, Son of Saṅgrāmadeva (AD 1252–1273)  JRT 105–112
10) Lakṣmadeva, adopted Son of Rāmadeva (AD 1273–1286)  JRT 113–117
11) Simhadeva, of unknown descent (AD 1286–1301)  JRT 118–129
12) Sūhadeva, Brother of Simhadeva (AD 1301–1320)  JRT 130–173
13) Lha·chen rgyal·bu Rin·chen, a Ladakhi Prince (AD 1320–1323)  JRT 174–220

Muslim Dynasty

Šāh Mīr

14) Udyānadeva, Brother of Sūhadeva (AD 1323 - 1339)  JRT 221-263
15) Koṭā Devī, widowed Queen of Udyānadeva (AD 1339)  JRT 264–307
16) Šams ad-Dīn (Šāh Mīr), last husband of Koṭā (AD 1339–1342)  JRT 308–315
17) Ğamšīd, Son of Šams ad-Dīn (AD 1342–1344)  JRT 316–338
18) ‘Alā’ ad-Dīn, Brother of Ğamšīd (AD 1344–1355)  JRT 339–359
19) Šīhāb ad-Dīn, Son of ‘Alā’ ad-Dīn (AD 1355–1373)  JRT 360–463
20) Qutb ad-Dīn, Brother of Šīhāb ad-Dīn (AD 1373–1389)  JRT 464–537
21) Sikandar Šāh Būtšikān, Son of Qutb-ad-Dīn (AD 1389–1413)  JRT 538–612
22a) ‘Alī Šāh, Son of Sikandar Šāh (AD 1413–1418)  JRT 613–706
22b) ‘Alī Šāh (AD 1419–1420)  JRT 715–749
23a) Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, Brother of ‘Alī Šāh (AD 1418–1419)  JRT 707–714
23b) Zayn al-‘Ābidīn (AD 1420–1470), account ends in AD 1459  JRT 750–976