Title

Translation and History: The Development of a Kashmiri Textual Tradition from ca. 1000-1500

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/68q7m3vv

Author

Obrock, Luther James

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Translation and History: The Development of a Kashmiri Textual Tradition from ca. 1000-1500

By

Luther James Obrock

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

South and Southeast Asian Studies

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Robert Goldman, Chair
Professor Alexander von Rospatt
Professor Munis Faruqui
Professor Abhishek Kaicker

Summer 2015

Abstract

Translation and History: The Development of a Kashmiri Textual Tradition from ca. 1000-1500

by

Luther James Obrock

Doctor of Philosophy in South and Southeast Asian Studies

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Robert Goldman, Chair

This dissertation investigates the Sanskrit works of four authors—Somadeva (fl. ca. 1080), Kalhaṇa (fl. ca. 1150), Jonarāja (ca. 1389-1459), and Śrīvara (fl. 1459-1505)—in the Valley of Kashmir. These authors produced a corpus of unique yet interconnected texts, writing in one of two particularly Kashmiri genres—either Kashmiri translational story literature, ślokakathā, or a regional poetic history, [rāja]taraṅgiṇī. The deployment and development of these two genres from the end of the eleventh to the early sixteenth centuries shows the development of a regionalized literature embedded in and adapting to changing social worlds. The first two works set the stage for this discussion. Somadeva's eleventh-century Kathāsaritsāgara, a same-language translation of the Bṛhatkathā, is exemplary of the ślokakathā genre. It crystalizes a specific set of source critical techniques and attitudes that are necessary for the production of a Kashmiri Sanskrit historiography. Using Somadeva's insights, Kalhaṇa fashions a new way of writing history in his twelfth century Rājataraṅgiṇī. Three centuries later in the much changed political and cultural landscape of the Kashmiri Sultanate, Jonarāja and Śrīvara continued Kalhaṇa's historical project in their own (rāja)taraṅgiṇī-s. Finally Śrīvara translated Jāmī's Persian romance the Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā into a ślokakathā, the Kathākautuka in 1505.

To understand this development and the texts' places in their moments of composition, this dissertation undertakes a series of contextualizations not to look for a homogenous or homogenizing "literary culture" of Sanskrit in Kashmir but rather to trace Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara's creative engagement with Sanskrit texts and genres. This dissertation shifts discussion away from the dominant scholarly idiom of cosmopolitanism to see Sanskrit literary production as deeply imbricated in the changing historical context of second millennium Kashmir. In this way I speak not of Sanskrit as a totalizing literary culture but rather of regionally and historically situated authors shaping new modes of Sanskrit discourse in the world. Sanskrit then, in such an understanding, is not a static form or mode to which authors appeal but a vital voice taking part in the shifting elite spheres from the Lohara Dynasty to the Shāh Mīrī Sultans in Kashmir.

Acknowledgements:

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Genre and History in Medieval Kashmir

1.1 Introduction: Contextualizing Genre and History

    This dissertation investigates the Sanskrit works of four authors—Somadeva (fl. ca. 1080), Kalhaṇa (fl. ca. 1150), Jonarāja (ca. 1389[1]-1459), and Śrīvara (fl. 1459-1505)—in the Valley of Kashmir. I concentrate on these authors because of the unique yet interconnected texts they produced. Each of these four wrote in one of two particularly Kashmiri genres—either Kashmiri translational story literature, *ślokakathā,*[2] or a regional poetic history, *[rāja]taraṅgiṇī*. I take Somadeva's eleventh-century *Kathāsaritsāgara*, a same-language translation of the *Bṛhatkathā*, as the exemplar of the *ślokakathā* genre and Kalhaṇa's twelfth-century verse history of Kashmir, the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, stands as the first instantiation of the *[rāja]taraṅgiṇī* genre. Three centuries later in the much changed political and cultural landscape of the Kashmiri Sultanate, Jonarāja and Śrīvara continued Kalhaṇa's historical project in their own *(rāja)taraṅgiṇī*-s. Finally Śrīvara translated Jāmī's Persian romance the *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā* into a *ślokakathā*, the *Kathākautuka* in 1505.   These works with their deeply intertwined genre histories provide raw material for this study, which traces the development of this particularly Kashmiri literature through an analysis of its deployment in two key eras in Kashmiri history: the two Lohara Dynasties 1003-1150 and the Later Shāh Mīrī Sultans 1420-1505.[3]
    I undertake a series of contextualizations not to look for a homogenous or homogenizing "literary culture" of Sanskrit in Kashmir but rather to trace Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara's creative engagement with Sanskrit texts and genres. To understand their texts I shift discussion away from the dominant scholarly idiom of cosmopolitanism to see Sanskrit literary production as deeply imbricated in the changing historical context of second millennium Kashmir. In this way I speak not of Sanskrit as a totalizing literary culture but rather of regionally and historically situated authors shaping new modes of Sanskrit discourse in the world. Sanskrit then, in such an understanding, is

---

[1] Walter Slaje estimates this date in the introduction to his edition and translation of Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. See Slaje, *Kingship in Kaśmīr (AD 1148-1459)*: *From the Pen of Jonarāja Court Paṇḍit to Sulṭān Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn*, 28.
[2] This term, which I borrow from Whitney Cox's essay "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness in Kalhaṇa: A Hypothesis." *IESHR* 50, 2 (Apr. 2013): 131-160. This term and Cox's arguments will be discussed at greater length in chapter two.
[3] These dates are both perhaps too precise and too vague. I date the "Lohara period" described in this text beginning with the accession of Saṃgrāmarāja, the first Lohara king, and ending with the date of Kalhaṇa's completion of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. This allows the inclusion of King Ananta, Somadeva's patron's husband (r. 1028-1063) within a larger unit. This is not to say this was a single unified and peaceful time. The reign of Harṣa (r. 1089-1101) and his eventual overthrow by Uccala (r. 1101-1111) marked the transfer of power to another branch of the family. Similarly the dates of the later ShāhMīrīs with the stabilization of Sultan Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn's rule in 1420 is bookended by the date of Śrīvara's last known composition in 1505.

not a static form or mode to which authors appeal but a vital voice taking part in the shifting elite spheres from the Lohara Dynasty to the Shāh Mīrī Sultans in Kashmir.

I describe this evolving Sanskritic literary culture in Kashmir as refracted through three major themes: region, historiography, and political and social change. Firstly, I focus on the regional career of Sanskrit in the hands of historically situated intellectuals in second millennium Kashmir. This allows me to place Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara in conversation with a growing body of scholarship on the region in South Asia. Secondly, this dissertation locates a text-critical Sanskrit historiography within a literary milieu and traces the changing relationship between this historiography and its political and social contexts. Thirdly, this dissertation attempts to think of these authors as deeply embedded in a world of knowledge in circulation, bound not only to Sanskritic ideas and developments, but also those of the vernacularizing and Persianizing world. Since Jonarāja and Śrīvara are located within a Sultanate court, they in particular offer material to rethink one of the basic categories of medieval South Asian history: the Hindu-Muslim encounter. I argue that the Sanskrit Sultanate works form an alternative sort of Indo-Persian intellectual culture, in which Jonarāja and Śrīvara actively negotiate the content and form of a new elite idiom. Each of these concerns animates the material collected here, and frames the close readings of these Kashmiri genres.

1.2 Regional and Cosmopolitan in Second Millennium Kashmiri Sanskrit

Charting the trajectory of Kashmiri translational story literature (*ślokakathā*) and histories (*rājataraṅgiṇī*) shows the development of a regional iteration of Sanskrit. The Sanskrit works of Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara are bound up in processes, debates, and negotiations that are often broadly characterized as vernacularization. The very "groundedness" of these texts in a certain Kashmiri landscape—both literally and metaphorically—is an organizing principle of my research. While large cultural formations such as the Sanskrit cosmopolis have received much attention in the historical scholarship on Sanskritic South Asia, a focus on regional Sanskritic production in moments of creativity and change can present other possible arrangements of literature, history, and representation. Sanskritic culture when seen as more than a closed system becomes a mode within a dynamic arena of elite audiences and expectations; in Kashmir, authors use Sanskrit to develop responses to the region, to the vernacularizing world, and to Persian elite cultural models and Islam. In this way, I do not see vernacularization as a reaction to Sanskrit; rather, intellectuals like Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja and Śrīvara took part in adapting a vernacularized Sanskrit in the changing elite landscape of Kashmiri Sanskrit from the eleventh through the early sixteenth century.

To understand this vernacularizing work in twelfth through fifteenth century Kashmir, I borrow the concept of a literary ecology from Shantanu Phukan who defines "ecology" as "the intricate interdependencies and rivalries" that make up a system.[4] This metaphor has much purchase in the study of Sanskrit from a regionally bound historically contingent perspective. This shift in perspective offers a corrective to the prevailing focus on Sanskrit as "universalizing" or "cosmopolitan" language. While a naïve and

---

[4] Shantanu Phukan, "'Through Throats Where Many Rivers Meet': The Ecology of Hindi in the World of Persian." *IESHR* 38: 3 (2001): 37.

ahistorical version of this view is often espoused in Hindu Nationalist historiography,[5] Sheldon Pollock articulates the most theoretically and historically astute formulation of the "Sanskrit cosmopolis" in his monumental study of Sanskrit literary culture, *Language of the Gods in the World of Men*. Pollock defines the Sanskrit cosmopolis as a historical and spatial construct delimited by Sanskrit aesthetic production freed of distinguishing qualities, repeated and reasserted by elites as an ideology of power. For Pollock, "The work Sanskrit did do was beyond the Quotidian and the instrumental; it was directed above all toward articulating a form of political consciousness and culture, politics not as transaction of material culture […] but as celebration of aesthetic power."[6] For Pollock, political consciousness trumped regional or historical contingency, and thus Sanskrit production assumed a specific ahistorical and transregional agency.

While Pollock's theory provided a powerful interpretive model for scholars of Sanskrit, the literary history of Kashmir in general—and the four authors highlighted here in particular—challenge the mechanics of this cosmopolitan model. Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja and Śrīvara presuppose an often tacit and inchoate understanding of their temporal and regional boundedness. While this awareness reveals itself more clearly in the *rājataraṅgiṇī*-s, the translational Kashmiri *ślokakathā*-s studied here also placed works from outside the Valley in a particularly Kashmiri context. I put Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja and Śrīvara in conversation with Yigal Bronner and David Shulman's insights that Sanskrit "brings with it unique assets such as the direct verbal and thematic continuities that transcend local contexts and that, for that very reason, enable a powerful articulation of the regional in its true fullness."[7] This insight guides my understanding of Sanskrit in this dissertation. The elite transregional cosmopolitan language developed a vocabulary for articulating a Kashmiri rootedness in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Jonarāja and Śrīvara show the continued relevance of these Sanskrit genres in elite discourse under the sultans. In this way I hold that "vernacular" texts are not defined by language but rather their use in the context of regional literature.[8]

---

[5] The Hindu nationalist iteration of this argument tends to be made in ahistorical of terms, speaking of a timeless and unitary world of Sanskrit only recently broken apart by the forces of Islam or modernity. Sumathi Ramaswamy traces the modern development of a universalized, national Sanskrit in her article "Sanskrit for the Nation," *Modern Asian Studies* 33.2 (1999): 339-381.

[6] Sheldon Pollock, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 14. Often forgotten is that for Pollock, the Sanskrit cosmopolis is a historically bound formation.

[7] Yigal Bronner and David Shulman. "'A Cloud Turned Goose': Sanskrit in the Vernacular Millenium." *IESHR* 43, 2 (2006): 28-9.

[8] The region as a distinct category has only recently begun to be seriously theorized in the study of premodern South Asia. Works such as Samira Sheikh's 2010 monograph *Forging a Region: Sultans, Traders, and Pilgrims in Gujarat 1200-1500* have begun to trace the contours of regional historiographies as actively constituting regional identities. Sheikh's book covers a similar time period to that covered in this dissertation, and in concentrating specifically on medieval Gujarat she draws on a variety of sources in a variety of languages. This dissertation attempts to follow Sheikh's focus on the making of regional identities, but focuses on the literary history of a single language, Sanskrit, in

Within these Kashmiri Sanskrit works, a tension with cosmopolitan Sanskrit still exists. On one hand there is the desire to find specific iterations of the Sanskritic on the regional level, while on the other there is the need to imagine Sanskrit as a unifying (and united) language. Regarding Kalhaṇa, in her essay "Making a Maṇḍala: Fuzzy Frontiers of Kalhaṇa's Kashmir," Kumkum Roy attempts to fill out the contours of Kalhaṇa's regional imagination. She writes:

> …[I]ts most powerful rulers were credited with the ability to intervene in and shape the destinies of distant lands. At the same time, there is an implicit and occasionally explicit recognition that Sanskritic and Brahminical traditions were derived from the world beyond the mountains. Thus the relationship is envisaged as a two way process. And, yet at another level, there is a somewhat reluctant acknowledgement that the maṇḍala was in effect part of a constellation of relatively small principalities that jostled for power and influence within their own realms as well as amongst their neighbors.[9]

Here, the tension between an imagined importance on a large scale and the position of being a player in a complicated world of North Indian politics is instructive on both a historical and metaphorical level. Roy reminds us of Kashmir's position as both an Indic polity taking part in a larger struggle for land and resources and also as a somewhat removed space, yet still in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* Sanskrit cosmopolitan ideas were involved in a system of exchange in which they were adapted, adopted, and transformed to fit a specific imagination.

1.3 Toward a Kashmiri Historiography

This dissertation limits its archive to texts that might be called "history" (*rājataraṅgiṇī*)[10] and the source-critical and translational story literature (Kashmiri *ślokakathā*) with which the *rājataraṅgiṇī* literature is always in conversation. These terms as genre classifiers are never used in the tradition itself, so much of this dissertation will be devoted to constructing ways of speaking about these texts. While the story literature of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* provides some incongruity when mapped onto modern western conceptual schemes, using the term history is especially problematic. The difficulty of speaking of a Kashmiri historical literature goes beyond the issue of external nomenclature; it extends to the very problem of historicity in South Asia itself.

---

two very specific genres as it attempts to navigate specific regional and historical contexts. The recent work of Aparna Kapadia in her 2013 article "The Last Chakravartin: The Gujarati Sultan as 'Universal King' in Fifteenth Century Sanskrit Poetry" further adds to the understanding of Sanskrit's role in elite Sultanate discourse.

[9] Kumkum Roy, "The Making of a Mandala: Fuzzy Frontiers of Kalhaṇa's Kashmir," in *The Power of Gender and the Gender of Power: Explorations in Early Indian History*. (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010), 354.

[10] Although never theorized as a genre as such in the Sanskrit sources, I use the term *rājataraṅgiṇī* with a lower-case *r* as a generic term for the historical texts of Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara (along with their later followers). *Rājataraṅgiṇī* with a capital *R* will refer to Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara's texts of that name specifically.

To many colonial scholars, India simply did not have a history. James Mill wrote in 1817 that "…in beholding the Hindus of the present day, we are beholding the Hindus of many ages past, and are carried back, as it were, into the deepest recesses of antiquity."[11] Almost one hundred years later very little had changed regarding the view of the historical situation of India. A. A. Macdonell famously stated in 1900 that, "Early India wrote no history because it never made any."[12] The oft-quoted pronouncements of Mill and Macdonell serve as reminders of colonial hubris as well as the failure to think about the culturally-conditioned nature of certain textual genres and disciplinary boundaries. In a perceptive article, James L. Fitzgerald notes: "That [colonial] misapprehension was due to misalignments of the cultural categories and sensibilities of two complex civilizations interacting across a poisonous colonial divide."[13] Fitzgerald then reminds us that there is no "cross-cultural gold standard" of history and historiography, it is only those wielders of power who attempt to define universal "objective" norms.[14]

Much work has gone into both questioning western imperial assumptions on the nature of history (the works of Partha Chatterjee and Romila Thapar spring to mind). Regarding Sanskrit sources, the problem of recovering a historical voice remains pressing. Scholars like Romila Thapar and Kunal Chakrabarti have developed theoretically astute methods of reading *purāṇa*-s historically, and Daud Ali presents *kāvya* literature as historically-determined reflections of elite culture. Yet perhaps strikingly, the type of methodological acumen used to provide innovative readings of historical consciousness in South Asia is absent from most modern readings of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. A tacit and untheorized acceptance of the unique historicity of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* often receives one line in the introduction of books about South Asian historical literature, but is often completely glossed over in its contents.[15]

For those that do concentrate on the actual Sanskrit text of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, there is a fascinating move towards a denial of historicity, or at least a denial that the

---

[11] James Mill, *A History of British India, Vol. 1.* (New Delhi: Associate Publishing House, 1972)*,* xxvi.

[12] Arthur Anthony Macdonell, *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1900), 11.

[13] James L. Fitzgerald, "History and Primordium in Ancient Indian Historical Writing: *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa* in the *Mahābhārata* and Beyond," in *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, ed. Kurt Raaflaub (Malden (Mass.) and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), 41.

[14] Fitzgerald, *ibid*.

[15] I happened to have the edited volume *History in the Vernacular* at hand, which attempts to tease out non-European historical cultures in South Asia. In his introduction, Partha Chatterjee writes "Other than the much cited but little read *Rājataraṅgiṇī*—Kalhaṇa's twelfth-century chronicle of Kashmir kings—there is no text in Sanskrit that resembles what we take to be a historical narrative" Chatterjee, "Introduction: History in the Vernacular," 1. Such sentences abound in modern Indian historiography, with scholars doing little more than noting its existence and its problematic place within the canon. Chatterjee's invocation of its "much cited but little read" status is indicative of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s conspicuous but ultimately impotent place in the imagination of Indian historians at large.

Rājataraṅgiṇī is definitionally a history. For many historians, it seems that Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*—and it is only Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* that receives attention in this regard, scholars have tended to dismiss or ignore later histories in Kashmir[16]—was seemingly somehow tainted by the fact that colonial scholars found in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* a sole example of "Hindu History", however defective.[17] Post-colonial scholars have somewhat ironically attempted to show that this is actually not the case, that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* should be read first and foremost as a *kāvya*, or specifically defined type of Sanskrit elite poetry. This view is useful, given that *kāvya* is a term indigenous to the tradition itself

       In his magisterial study of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Bernhard Kölver states: "It seems to me completely wrong to interpret Kalhaṇa's work primarily as work of history." After listing the typically *kāvya*-esque features of the text, he concludes that "such representations belong precisely in the scope of a *kāvya*."[18] Emphasizing the literary qualities of the text[19] gives new insight into the composition of the work. Shonaleekha Kaul also takes the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* "not as history, but as what it itself claims and proves to be, namely a *kāvya*." In her view, any sort of claims to objectivist historiography should be thrown out the window and "the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* should be viewed as a whole as the traditional *kāvya* that it is, representing a specific language practice which sought to produce meaning as much as space, and was articulative of the poet's vision."[20] Kaul's idea that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is "articulative" meaning that it expresses a certain viewpoint informed by a certain ideology is important, and the choice of *kāvya* over history is obvious, since *kāvya* is a Sanskrit term used by the poet while "history" imports a western term with a western genealogy. However it seems that regarding both Kölver and Kaul that valorizing *kāvya* at the expense of history may occlude the important way in which these two categories might illuminate one another in the context of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

---

[16] The work of Walter Slaje is one major exception to this trend. See for instance his close readings of the opening verses of the later *Rājataraṅgiṇī*-s in his 2008 article "Geschichte *schreiben*: Vier historiographische Prologe aus Kaschmir." *ZMDG* 158, 2 (2008) 317-51.

[17] The editor and translator of Kalhaṇa's text Aurel Stein, while holding the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* was in some way a history, decried what he saw as an uncritical mixture of fact and fiction in the text itself. He writes: "The Indian mind as never learned to divide mythology and legendary tradition from true history." Aurel Stein, introduction to *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr*, ed. and trans. by Marc Aurel Stein (Constable: Westminster, 1900), 28.

[18] "Es scheint mir überhaupt irrig, Kalhaṇa's Werk primär als Geschichtswerk zu interpretieren. […] derartige Schilderungen gehören eben zum Bestand eines *kāvya*." Bernard Kölver, *Textkritische und Philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājataraṅgiṇī des Kalhaṇa* (Weisbaden: F. Steiner, 1971), 8-9.

[19] Aurel Stein purposefully ignored many "literary" elements in his own translation, often excising what he considered didactic verses from the text. This was due, in part, to his attempt to recover and highlight "real" history in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

[20] Shonaleekha Kaul, "Kalhaṇa's Kashmir: Aspects of the Literary Production of Space in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*," *Indian Historical Review* 40, 2 (2013): 208.

This discomfort regarding the historicity of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* becomes a flat out denial of it in Velcheru Narayana Rao, David Shulman, and Sanjay Subrahmanyam's *Textures of Time*. They argue that any true claim to Kalhaṇa's historicity is a sham: "Ironically, just as historiography may be hidden in other generic disguises, fiction may easily hide in a form that Western eyes have a little too hastily seen as historiography."[21] The authors of *Textures of Time* argue that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* should be seen not as history but historical fiction, adducing examples from the highly stylized way in which Kalhaṇa describes certain events, the literary quality of the organization of some episodes, and that he was not actually a witness of the events he describes. Although the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* was not the main focus of the historical argument of *Textures of Time*, the author's criteria for excluding Kalhaṇa's work seems arbitrary.[22] Further, singling out of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as historical in appearance only seems to contradict the central theoretical intervention of the book.

Earlier, Narayana Rao, Shulman, and Subrahmanyam argued, "history is written in the dominant literary genre of a particular community, located in space, at a given moment in time."[23] In their zeal to find a culturally conditioned mode of historical writing in South India, *Textures of Time* ironically ends up reifying one iteration of South Asian historiography as "history" while dismissing what could be another instantiation of their thesis. Here, my reading of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* will attempt to do just what *Textures of Time* suggests, to sketch "the logic and sensibility that shaped an entire conceptual system"[24]—that is the roots and form of Kashmiri historical expression. I show that Kalhaṇa's historicity is rooted in a Kashmiri genealogy of texts and ideas. Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*, then, provides something akin to Shulman, Narayana Rao, and Subrahmanyam's "dominant literary genre." Locating the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in the *ślokakathā* genealogy allows us to think through the often distracting false binaries of *kāvya* or "history". These twinned genres continue into the Shāh Mīri Sultanate and provide a glimpse into the durability and elasticity of these genres in vastly changed political and social circumstances.

1.4 Continuity and Change: Circulation and Encounter in Second Millennium Kashmir

The final conversation into which I place Kashmiri *ślokakathā*-s and *rājataraṅgiṇī*-s is that of the circulation, and adaptation of knowledge in the early second millennium. The *ślokakathā*-s took source material from outside of the Valley and transformed it into a specifically Kashmiri idiom while Kalhaṇa's history attempts to articulate a temporally bounded and situated Kashmir. Although knowledge circulation is an important undercurrent in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, with the arrival of Islam and Persianate modes of politics and aesthetics Sanskritic intellectuals in fifteenth century Kashmir tested the elasticity of these genres with their own elite works. While

---

[21] Narayana Rao, Velcheru, David Shulman and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Textures of Time: Writing History in South India 1600-1800* (New York: Other Press, 2003), 257.
[22] This aspect of the book has been ably critiqued by Sheldon Pollock in his review of the book "Pretextures of Time." *History and Theory* 46 (2007): 364-381.
[23] Narayana Rao *et al.*, *Textures of Time*, 4.
[24] *ibid*. p. 23.

Somadeva and Kalhaṇa each live at moments of political strife, a close examination of Jonarāja and Śrīvara's work will highlight the interaction between older Sanskritic forms new forms of culture introduced with the coming of Islam. This contextualization further builds upon themes of historical representation and change, and must again pick up the threads from the preceding discussions of history, historicity, and regionalism. Between the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa and Jonarāja's revival of this form under Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn in the fifteenth century, the Kashmir Valley saw the introduction of new religious and cultural forms from Central and West Asia, most notably the religion of Islam and the Persian language. This change is often described as so radical, so absolute, that is can only be described in terms of rupture. For many historians, in these years in the early second millennium we pass from one period South Asia's past to another. For early colonial and nationalist histories we have definitively passed from the Classical Hindu period of Ancient South Asia to the Muslim period of Medieval and Early Modern South Asia. The arrival of Muslims in the Subcontinent is seen almost as a "year zero", a new beginning.

The problem with such a view of history is that it tends to ignore the actual temporal span and the interactions that went into making this new Islamic or Islamicate world.[25] This dissertation argues that Islam, and more specifically its Persianate high-cultural formation interacted with previous Sanskrit forms in a creative manner. In this way I situate my work in the same vein as Phillip Wagoner in "Sultan among Hindu Kings," and Finbarr Flood's *Objects of Translation*. The works of Jonarāja and Śrīvara show that the Sanskrit literary culture defined by Somadeva and Kalhaṇa adapts to new political and cultural circumstances. I argue that a careful reading of Śrīvara and Jonarāja can provide a sketch of a specific iteration of the Indo-Persian, which became deeply rooted in a regional Sanskrit imagination.

The pernicious effects of religious-based periodicization (and the concomitant nationalist historiographies) have already been outlined. The idea of monolithic communities defined by religious identities is well-entrenched in both the popular memory and by religious nationalist South Asian historiography.[26] Much of the work by

---

[25] Here and throughout I tend to utilize Marshall Hodgson's useful term "Islamicate" over the other possibilities (such as "Islamic") as it (following Hodgson) "refer[s] not directly to the religion, Islam, itself, but to the social and cultural complex historically associated with Islam and the Muslims, both among Muslims themselves and when found among non-Muslims." Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 59. An equivalent term to explain a similar cultural complex based on classical Indian cultural expectations is needed in order to undertake any sort of historical discussion involving the engagement of two elite cultural spheres. In her recent dissertation "Cosmopolitan Encounters", Audrey Truschke prefers the term "Indic" as the South Asian equivalent. While recognizing the utility of this term (and sometimes resorting to it myself), I employ the term "Sanskritic" almost as a counterpart to "Persianate" to emphasize the cultural-linguistic aspect of these texts and their engagement with the changing literary ecology of Sultanate South Asia.

[26] For nationalists, see Vinayak Damodar's *Hindutva* (Pune: S. R. Date, 1942) for its most powerful articulation. For historiography, the classic statement is Aziz Ahmad,

Sanskritists still holds tightly to these divisions,[27] although this has been questioned pointedly by Brajdulal Chattopadhyaya in his volume *Representing the Other? Sanskrit Sources and the Muslims*. However Chattopadhyaya's polemic needs to be rooted in more careful investigations of the sources and an awareness of the multiple possibilities of representation of Muslims in different contexts. Chattopadhyaya's work is a necessary first step, but the contours of specific interactions need to be further explored before drawing sweeping conclusions. This dissertation hopes to elucidate one part of this conversation.

My understanding of this Kashmiri archive has been greatly influenced by a new critical historiography looking at the arrival and establishment of Islam in the Subcontinent. Many insightful works have laid the historiographical ground towards a more nuanced understanding of Hinduism and Islam. For instance in her influental 2005 monograph *Somanatha: The Many Voices of a History*, Romila Thapar shows the way in which different sources from different points of view can complicate histories that nationalist historiographies have made black and white. However, her book ends up re-reifying these divisions by dividing the sources according to religion and emphasizing an unknowability regarding "real" events at moments of encounter. Further, her book emphasizes moments of violence and conflict. I rather concentrate on the creative negotiations in elite contexts, seeing Śrīvara and Jonarāja as part of an attempt toward creating a specific sort of Indo-Persian elite culture.

Such a project has been outlined in the influential article "Sultan among Hindu Kings" by Philip Wagoner. Wagoner shows the way in which Islamicate courtly and elite practices entered into the Vijayanagara court. He breaks down the easy dichotomy between "Hindu" Vijayanagara and the surrounding "Muslim" Sultanates. He argues that these polities did not exist in the state of natural enmity embodying a Huntingtonian "Clash of Civilizations", but rather Vijayanagara actively took part in the new Islamicate elite culture. Wagoner focuses on bodily elite practices and shows that Islamicate ideas informed courtly protocol within the Hindu kingdom. Such an analysis seriously questions the idea of discrete religiously bound civilizational units. In this dissertation I hope to use Wagoner's insight of changing political influences to see the way in which Islamicate expectations influenced Sanskrit in Sultanate Kashmir.[28]

However, the Sanskrit texts produced under the Shāh Mīrīs complicate the idea that influence moves in one direction. The work of Finbarr Flood in his work *Objects of Translation* shows the way in which new cultural forms and ideas did not simply come

---

"Epic and Counter Epic in Medieval India," *JAOS* 84, 4 (1963): 470-476.

[27] The most influential argument for the resurgence of a Hindu identity in the face of Muslim incursions is no doubt Sheldon Pollock's "The *Rāmāyaṇa* in the Political Imagination," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 52, 2 (1993): 261–297. For a more recent example, see Basile Leclère, "Ambivalent Representations of Muslims in Medieval Indian Theatre." *Studies in History* 27, 2 (2011): 155-195.

[28] Other scholars have looked at Sanskrit in Sultanate contexts. For instance, Aparna Kapadia has looked at the fascinating and understudied Sanskrit texts on Sultanate Gujarat. However, her work is overdetermined by simplistic ideas of "Hindu" kingship. See Kapadia "The Last Chakravartin," 2013.

into India from the Islamicate world, rather ideas circulated in a larger Asian space. Islamic and Islamicizing dynasties quickened this circulation. I take Flood's arguments seriously and try to place the works of Jonarāja and especially Śrīvara in such a fluid and dynamic world, but focus on texts rather than material culture. The final chapters of this dissertation will look at the ways Islam and Islamicate history enter into and transform and is transformed by Sanskrit ideas.

1.5. Plan of the Dissertation:

Close readings will form the core of this dissertation. While still broadly contextualizing the works, their authors, and their historical contexts, I concentrate first and foremost on the Sanskrit language itself, how it was deployed, what connections it invoked, and what strategies it adapted to change with its changing Kashmiri home. Divided roughly in half, the first part of the dissertation presents two seminal texts of the eleventh and twelfth century: Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* and Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. A reading of these texts will provide the conceptual vocabulary for the investigation of Sanskrit works in Sultanate Kashmir. The second half will look at the adoption and adaption of the *ślokakathā* and the *rājataraṅgiṇī* in the Shāhmīrī Sultanate court. The two halves of this dissertation thus show the development of a Sanskrit vernacular and its deployment in two changing and creatively charged contexts.

The second chapter presents Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* as exemplary of a certain genre of texts, the Kashmiri *slokakathā*. This chapter argues that Somadeva's work brings together the ingredients for a Kashmiri historiography: the *śloka* meter, a particularly Kashmiri stylistic, and a text critical literary perspective. I highlight this final characteristic since the translational and transformational logic encoded within the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is an important prerequisite for the creation of historiography in the *rajataraṅgiṇīs*. Further, Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* gives structure to the translational projects undertaken later in the Shahmiri court, since Śrīvara uses it as his model for the translation of a Persian poem. Through a close reading of the first chapter of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, the *Kathāpīṭhā* or "The Seat of Story", I show that in the process of transforming the text, Somadeva provides the basis for a historical imagination. This inchoate historical criticism, the transformational logic of the text itself, and its powerful stylistic register provide the building blocks for Kalhaṇa's historiography in his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

The third chapter moves to the actual genesis of the *rajataraṅgiṇī* genre through close readings of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* itself. I effect a series of contextualizations in order to situate the text with respect to genres, ideas, and texts developing in Kashmir. These include political aesthetics of *kāvya*, or courtly poetry, Kashmiri textual genealogies, and the utilization of theoretical concepts like *rasa*, or poetic flavor. This chapter shows the negotiations Kalhaṇa undertakes to create a historical poem in the context of Sanskrit literature.

The fourth chapter turns the tension between narrating the past and the present. Kalhaṇa's moral vision for understanding and narrating the past presupposes a mutability in the character of kings; their greatness is never stable and their fortunes are never lasting. In the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, legendary Kashmiri kings like Lalitāditya, Jayāpīḍa, and Harṣa begin with an uncanny brilliance, yet their careers inevitably slide into violence

and madness. With an almost Buddhist emphasis on transience, the great centerpieces of Kalhaṇa's narrative attempt to evoke in the reader a feeling of world-weariness, the basis of the aesthetic experience of *śānta rasa*, or the aesthetic sentiment of total pacification. While this organizational scheme works well for an organization of the past, it sets uncomfortably with the contingent representation of a messy and uncertain present. The second portion of this chapter outlines Kalhaṇa's complicated relationship with the present. The challenge of balancing the world-weary, "normal" historiography of the past with the representation of the contemporary era, with its unfinished nature and issues of patronage, absorbs Kalhaṇa's attention for the final and longest section of his text.

The second half of this dissertation begins in chapter five, in which I move forward in time to Sultanate Kashmir. The fifth chapter introduces Jonarāja and his works. Jonarāja writes from within the elite circles of Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn's rule in Kashmir. Sultanate Kashmir is an interesting anomaly in the history of South Asia. It is a Muslim dynasty, yet the only contemporary historical records available are written in Sanskrit from a Hindu perspective. Jonarāja and his works are thus provocatively positioned between two worldviews: the Islamicate and the Sanskritic. Here I concentrate on the way in which Jonarāja deals with continuity and rupture, especially in regard to religious communities. I argue that he struggles to accommodate Islam in his worldview, and to this end attempts to create an inclusive yet aware courtly Sanskrit.

The sixth chapter focuses on the relationship between Śrīvara's fifteenth-century *Jainataraṅgiṇī* and Kalhaṇa's twelfth-century *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Writing in the court of Sultan Zayn ul-'Ābidīn, Śrīvara relies on Kalhaṇa's work as the literary and theoretical model for the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, but proceeds to adapt the form to reflect needs specific to narrating a biography of Zayn. I show that Śrīvara carefully orders and rearranges the events of the Sultan's life in order to create a narrative that largely follows the aesthetic and moral expectations articulated in Kalhaṇa's earlier *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Yet despite Śrīvara's attempts to make his own work philosophically conformable to that of his predecessor, the historiographical background implicit in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* shows subtle shifts in conceptions of royal representation and the agency of fate. I argue that these shifts provide important clues to understand the specific moment in Kashmiri political and literary history made possible by a unique relationship between patron and poet. Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī* shows the elastic possibilities of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* form as it operates in the vastly changed political and social circumstances of Sultanate Kashmir.

The final chapter of this dissertation switches focus to Śrīvara's translational project at the court of Moḥammad Shāh, the *Kathākautuka* (*The Wonder of Story*). While it was completed almost twenty years after the abrupt stop of his history, this work shows the way in which twelfth-century Kashmiri culture continues to shape Kashmiri culture in the sixteenth. The *Kathākautuka* translates Jāmī's famous reworking of the story of the prophet Yūsuf and the beautiful Zulaykhā. Based on the twelfth *sūra* of the Qur'ān, Jāmī's skillful telling transforms the story into a stunning meditation on beauty and devotion to God. Jāmī's *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā* immediately offered a compelling poetic and religious vision and quickly moved throughout the Persianate and Islamicate world.[29] I

---

[29] The wide and rapid diffusion of Jāmī's work is the focus of the interdisciplinary working group "A Worldwide Literature: Jāmī (1414-1492) in the *Dār al-Islām* and

argue that Śrīvara's translation stands as clever exploration of differences everyone at the court would have already been aware. That difference, the line that separates the Persian from the Sanskrit, the Islamic from the Hindu is constantly pushed at and played with throughout the text.

Śrīvara's cleverness is rooted in an awareness of both Sanskrit and Islamic textual practices, an awareness he implicitly ascribes to his audience as well. The wordplay and redirection in the *Kathākautuka* is an audacious celebration of religious boundaries and difference, encoded within a court-based literary economy. Here we see the effects of an intertwined court culture playing itself out. My discussion of the translational methodology of Śrīvara situates the complex set of negotiations occurring in the elite sphere in sixteenth century Kashmir. Śrīvara's Sanskrit text shows a deep awareness of Persianate cultural attitudes and Islamic expectations and his verbal winks and play show an awareness and celebration of difference. I argue that Śrīvara's text is directed toward a courtly milieu in which cultural appropriation and translation were part of a knowing play. In the *Kathākautuka*, we see Sanskrit negotiating a place in the Sultanate court, taking part as a knowing participant in the creation of a Kashmiri Indo-Persian culture.

The fifteenth-century moment adapted the creative insights of the twelfth century in order to articulate a place for Sanskrit in the Muslim courts of the Shāhmīrī Sultans. I argue that the regional Sultanates of pre-Mughal South Asia provided a fertile ground for new and creative uses of the Sanskritic past, one in which Sanskrit engaged with an Islamicate present in specifically Sanskrit terms.

In the end, my focus on two genres embedded in Kashmiri literary history will show the ways in which authors adapted to new historical realities. In "'Cloud Turned Goose'", Yigal Bronner and David Shulman state that in the second millennium "Sanskrit itself is continuously changing, stretching the boundaries of the sayable, thinking new thoughts, searching for new ways to formulate this newness. As such, its history remains to be studied."[30] This dissertation hopes to add a small voice to Bronner and Shulman's call to action, to draw out the ways in which Sanskrit adapted to address new concerns and creatively engaged with new cultural forms and ideas.

Beyond." For more information on Jāmī and on the extent and magnitude of the textual tradition his work inaugurated, see: http://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/jamidaralislam/.
[30] Bronner and Shulman, "'A Cloud Turned Goose,'" 29.

Chapter 2.

2.1. Introduction: The *Slokakathā* in History

        In tracing the development of a Kashmiri historical sensibility, I begin with Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara,* a work that marks the maturity of the *ślokakathā* genre and which becomes, as I will argue, indispensible for the later literary and historical imagination in the Valley. Somadeva's eleventh-century masterpiece exerted an enormous influence on the later literary production in Kashmir. A product of the Valley's cultural efflorescence in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* was very much rooted in Kashmir. It looked back to previous works like Abhinanda's ninth-century *Kādambarīkathāsāra* to provide its formal inspiration, and, unlike works of tantric exegesis or aesthetic theory, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*'s influence remained confined within the Valley for centuries. A long work consisting of intertwined vignettes of the adventures of heroes and demigods, the creative fantasy of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* may seem an odd starting point for a dissertation concerned with historiography and regional literature. However Somadeva's text stands as the most mature articulation of a specifically Kashmiri form which intends to both transform existing sources and create new artistic visions. I begin to trace the genealogy of a specifically Kashmiri "vernacular" Sanskrit with this text, which provides a model for the accommodation of new forms and ideas into the Kashmiri Sultanate.

        To understand the importance of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* for later intellectual developments, it must first be contextualized within its Kashmiri historical and intellectual milieu. One of the most common works of Sanskrit literature in modern university-based curricula in the West, its name-recognition no doubt owes much to the Sanskrit chrestomathy canonized in introductory Sanskrit language courses. After an interminable reading of the misadventures of Nala in Lanman's reader, the second-year student then makes a brief pause in the lush world of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* before turning to more pressing and pertinent texts—in the opinion of Lanman—the *Mānavadharmaśāstra,* the *Gṛhyasūtra*-s, and of course the end goal of the volume, selections from the *Veda*. While the foregrounding of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* as a teaching text has indeed placed the work in the forefront of the imagination of Sanskrit in the West, it has, I would argue, unfairly implied that the position of the text is somewhere lower than the serious literature to which a student of Sanskrit should be directed or must aspire.

        That is not to say that the *Kathāsaritsāgara* has suffered from a lack of scholarly attention. As the popularity of C. H. Tawney's two-volume translation (expanded into ten deluxe bibliophile volumes with the additions of N. M. Penzer's notes) as well as numerous other modern translations and abridgments attest, the tales in Somadeva's work circulate widely today and are often used as an introduction to the life and literature of ancient India. In Tawney and Penzer's work, the text is framed as a mirror to ancient South Asian folk life. Indeed, the work itself is often categorized within the genre of "folklore". Such a reading elides the particularly Kashmiri genesis of Somadeva's work and the historical importance of the text for Kashmiri literary culture. I argue that Somadeva's tale drew upon several centuries of Kashmiri literature and crystallizes a certain sort of literary attitude, which constitutes a type of source criticism. In fact, the

paratextual material framing the *Kathāsaritsāgara* shows the text to be deeply imbricated in the courtly life and intellectual climate of Kashmir in the eleventh century.[31] To explicate these connections, I look at its specifically Kashmiri textual genealogy, the historical placement of the text in Kashmir, and the historical imagination shown in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* itself.

The *Kathāsaritsāgara*, most probably written sometime between 1063 and 1081 for Queen Sūryavatī, wife of King Ananta,[32] tells a version of the legendary "Great Story" (*bṛhatkathā*) ascribed to Guṇāḍhya. A gigantic work of one hundred and twenty-four chapters in more than twenty thousand *śloka*-s, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* regales the reader with stories of the Vidyādharas, a class of demigods, and Naravāhanadatta's quest to become their ruler. However, this basic story is only visible at the largest level of the text itself; most of the work consists of densely interwoven short vignettes. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* is in many ways a treasury of stories, like the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*—although Somadeva eschews any sort of political or ethical moralizing. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* is perhaps more similar to something like the Arabic *One*

---

[31] For a more extensive reading of the complex courtly and elite world that Somadeva's world implies, see Janet Um, "Crossing the Ocean of Story" (MA Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2012).

[32] Ananta ruled from 1028-1063. His reign is described from 7.135-7.456 in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa. Ananta's rule was tumultuous at best; he abdicated and, having had a change of heart fought with his son Kalaśa to recover the throne. He took his own life by bleeding to death (see *RT* 7.446). Kalhaṇa portrays Ananta as fully under the thumb of Sūryavatī (also called Sūryamatī), who engineered his abdication and eventual suicide. Owing to the complicated political situation, Sūryamatī was unable to see her son Kalaśa, and threw herself into the flames of her husband's funeral pyre as a *satī*. Kalhaṇa describes the scene as follows:

> *evaṃ viśuddhaśīlatvaṃ saṃprakāśya sucismitā |*
> *karṇīrathād adāj jhampāṃ jvalite jātavedasi ||7.478||*
> *ajāyanta nabho vahnijvālāvalayamālitam |*
> *tadāgamotsave dattasindhūram iva nirjaraiḥ ||7.479||*
> *sākrandair na caṭutkārī duḥkhottaptar na coṣmalaḥ |*
> *param ālekhyalikhita iva jajñe śikhī janaiḥ ||7.480||*

> She thus made it clear that her conduct was completely purified, and, smiling brightly, she jumped from her litter into the blazing fire. The heavens became garlanded with rings of fiery flames, as if the ageless gods had painted them with vermillion for her arrival celebration. The people did not notice the crackling of the fire because of their wailing, nor its heat because of their [hot] grief. It was as if [the scene were] drawn in a picture.

It somehow seems fitting that Kalhaṇa transforms her death into a kind of art. For a further insightful reading of Somadeva, Sūryamatī, and their historical and literary context, see Um "Crossing the Ocean of Story."

Thousand and One Nights, which sometimes shares similar tales with the Indic story tradition.

Somadeva places the *Kathāsaritsāgara* in Kashmiri elite circles, and the polished, funny, and stylistically expert verse of the text points to expectations of erudition and taste on the part of its audience. That the work is directed towards a learned audience does not, of course, preclude its "humble" or "popular" origins, rather it shows the way in which Somadeva appropriated a tradition of tales and transformed it into something quite different. In this way, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is a meta-text. With the linguistic equivalent of winks and nods, the work is constantly aware of its textual history, and forever playing with the boundaries of its content and form. Somadeva's brief introduction to the *Kathāsaritsāgara* shows that the text is a transformation or translation of existing material and his brief autobiographical coda shows this text to be imagined within a certain historical and political world. Somadeva's retelling of the *Bṛhatkathā* or "Great Story" contains within itself an almost celebratory awareness of its own textual history and its place within literary and political history.

The self-conscious text-criticism that undergirds the *Kathāsaritsāgara* makes it a powerful model in the elastic and ever-transforming literary culture of second millennium Kashmir. At its most basic level, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*—like other *kathā* works—is a translation; it brings a work into a new stylistic and structural idiom. As such it encodes within it an underlying methodology of production through transformation. This philosophy is never systematically laid out and must be uncovered through Somadeva's own remarks as well as through a close reading of the text. For such an analysis, the paratextual material is of especial use.

To analyze the *Kathāsaritsāgara*'s presentation of its own textuality, I first look toward the Kashmiri Sanskrit literary tradition in which the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is rooted. Second I show a specifically Sanskrit genre that includes Somadeva and illuminates the *Kathāsaritsāgara*'s self-imagination. Finally I will discuss the themes of totality and fragmentation in Somadeva's text. This discussion will carry through the entire dissertation as writers attempt to organize complete visions of history but are unable because of the messy and unpredictable present. I will conclude with a few thoughts on the possible theorizing of alternate historiographies in eleventh- and twelfth-century Kashmir, and the relevance of *Kathāsaritsāgara* for understanding the literary history of Sanskrit histories.

2.2: *Kathā* in Theory and Practice: Genre and Source in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*

At its most basic level, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is a retelling of the legendary tale known as the "Great Story", the *Bṛhatkathā*. Since the work is a retelling, its very existence implies a relationship between Somadeva's work and his sources. Yet the exact nature of this relationship is difficult to conceptualize since the text of the original *Bṛhatkathā* has long been lost—if indeed an original, fixed, unitary work called the *Bṛhatkathā* ever existed in the first place. While most scholarship on Somadeva has taken for granted that the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is an instantiation of an earlier work, the exact nature of this retelling in terms of Sanskrit literary culture in Kashmir has been

little theorized.[33] Most accounts of the composition of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* deny Somadeva any sort of creative or artistic agency whatsoever and instead see the work as a literalistic condensation of the earlier source.[34] Through a close reading of the concepts underlying the *Kathāsaritsāgara* however this section will show that Somadeva adapts, subverts, and transforms older forms to create his own telling.

To understand Somadeva's project, one must begin to unpack the rich world of texts, ideas, and associations that supported the resurgence of *kathā* in Kashmir in a new and changed form. The relationship between Somadeva's sources and his finished *Kathāsaritsāgara* demonstrates the importance of the work for Kashmiri literary history—in particular for understanding the development of its historiography. In this way, the *Kathāsaritsagara* and its relation to Sanskrit theories of genre delineate the large-scale text criticism that informs and underlies Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*.

Kathā as a genre term first enters the theoretical lexicon of Sanskrit poetics in the sixth/seventh century theorizations of the poetician Daṇḍin, although in his *Kāvyadarśa* the exact valence of the term is difficult to pin down. In essence, it is this creative slippage around the concept of *kathā* that I hope to trace, and Daṇḍin's works give a good picture of the tensions surrounding literarized *kathā*, given that he both theorizes and practices *kathā*. That Daṇḍin attempts a definition indicates the growing importance of new genres and the theorists' need to place it within a normative framework. In his *Kāvyādarśa*, Daṇḍin speaks of *kathā* as one of two sorts of non-metrical poetry (which he terms *gadya*) distinguishing *kathā* from the second type, *ākhyāyikā*. The entirety of Daṇḍin's discussion occurs in verses 1.23-1.28 of the *Kāvyadarśa*. He writes:

> *apādaḥ padasaṃtāno gadyam ākhyāyikā kathā |*
> *iti tasya prabhedau dvau tayor ākhyāyikā kila ||1.23||*
> *nāyakenaiva vācyānyā nāyakenetareṇa vā |*
> *svaguṇāviṣkriyādoṣo nātra bhūtārthaśaṃsinaḥ ||1.24||*
> *api tv aniyamo dṛṣṭas tatrāpy anyair udīraṇāt |*
> *anyo vaktā svayaṃ veti kīdṛg vā bhedakāraṇam ||1.25||*

---

[33] The fullest account of the *Bṛhatkathā* tradition and its diffusion, Donald Nelson's doctoral thesis *The Bṛhatkathā: A Reconstruction from the Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha, Peruṅkatai and Vasudevahiṃḍi* (University of Chicago, 1974), leaves the Kashmiri texts of Kṣemendra and Somadeva out of his reconstruction of an *Ur-Bṛhatkathā*. He argues that these two texts are too different from the other tellings to be of any use. Nelson is drawing upon the earlier work of Felix Lacôte, who in his monograph *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1908) argues for a Paiśācī intermediary between the putative *Ur-Bṛhatkathā* which gave rise to the Prakrit, Tamil, and other Sanskrit tellings. While the intricacies of these reconstructive arguments are beyond the scope of the present discussion, it is interesting to note how awkwardly the Kashmiri tellings fit in the receptive history schema of the *Bṛhatkathā*.

[34] For instance, in her introduction to a recent translation and abridgement of the *Kathāsaritsāgara,* Arshia Sattar writes that "[…] Somadeva performed the role of a compiler, a re-teller of tales rather than an 'author' in the modern sense of the term." Sattar, introduction to *Tales from the Kathāsaritsāgara*, by Somadeva (London: Penguin, 1994), p. xvi.

vaktraṃ cāparavaktraṃ ca socchvāsatvaṃ ca bhedakam |
cihnam ākhyāyikāyāś cet prasaṅgena kathāsv api ||1.26||
āryādivat praveśaḥ kiṃ na vaktrāparavaktrayoḥ |
bhedaś ca dṛṣṭo lambhādir ucchvāso vastu kiṃ tataḥ ||1.27||
tat kathākhyāyikety ekā jātiḥ saṃjñādvayāṅkitā |
atraivāntarbhaviṣyanti śeṣāś cākhyānajātayaḥ ||1.28||[35]

> Non-metrical sequences of words [are called] *gadya* (prose). The two
> types of it are *ākhyāyikā* and *kathā*. It is well-known that the *ākhyāyikā* is
> to be spoken by only the protagonist and the other [=*kathā*] is to be spoken
> by the protagonist or someone else. Since [the hero] is [merely] stating
> the real state of affairs (*bhūtārtha*), there is no fault (*doṣa*) in disclosing
> his own qualities here (=in an *ākhyāyikā*). However, in that case too [=in
> the case of the *kathā*] no fixed rule is seen because it can be narrated by
> others. Whether someone else or oneself is a speaker is a weak point of
> distinction for a differentiation. […] Therefore "*kathā*" and "*ākhyāyikā*"
> are only a single type marked by a pair of words. Further, within that
> alone will all other types of narration be included.

The twinned definitions of *kathā* and *ākhyāyikā* point to the difficulty in dealing with a
burgeoning profusion of art prose in the sixth and seventh century—the very necessity of
splitting the genre into two seemingly arbitrary divisions speaks of the need to organize
and systematize the genre. While the intricacies of Daṇḍin's discussion are beyond the
scope of this discussion, what is most striking about Daṇḍin's definition is the halting,
almost provisional feel. Daṇḍin's argument for a speaker-based differentiation seems to
be an artificial attempt to give a definitive place to fluid, changeable, and changing terms
in the literary culture of the Subcontinent. Despite its presence in such early descriptive
and prescriptive texts, the exact meaning of the *kathā* was both contested and used in
various senses throughout history. This earliest of definitions shows two sorts of pulls,
one toward a coherent systemization and one toward recognizing a certain uncontrollable
proliferation in the tradition itself.[36] We can see in Daṇḍin's definition that story
literature moved into the literary world in a surprising and often messily untheorizable
way.

---

[35] Daṇḍin, *Kavyādarśa*, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (1938): 25-29.

[36] The great historian of Sanskrit literature, S. K. De attempts to offer a coherent reading
of both the meaning of the term and the intellectual debate surrounding it with limited
success. He synthetically defines *kathā* as follows: "(1) The subject matter is generally a
love story, for the most part invented by the poet; (2) The narrator should be some person
other than the hero, who may sometimes take that role; (3) There is no division into
chapters; (4) It should have a literary metrical introduction." De, "The Akhyayika and the
Katha in Classical Sanskrit," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 3, 3 (1924): 517.
While such a definition may work for one self-styled *kathā*, Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, De's
argument is especially weak in respect to the vast number of other sorts of text that use
the term *kathā* as descriptive markers, especially works like the *Kathāsaritsāgara*.

Daṇḍin's definitional exercises should be compared to the texts themselves, most importantly the *Vāsavadatta* of Subandhu, the *Kādambarī* and *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa, and Daṇḍin's own *Daśakumaracarita.* These texts were hugely important and traveled far throughout the Sanskritic world. In the case of the *Kādambarī* and *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa, their influence cannot be underestimated in Kashmir. As Aurel Stein notes, a number of old manuscripts of these works exist in Kashmir, and the earliest text in the *ślokakathā* genre, the *Kādambarīkathāsāra*, retells Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.[37] Further, Stein convincingly demonstrated Kalhaṇa's careful reading of the *Harṣacarita* in his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.[38] The question then becomes how to understand the influential art prose of Subandhu, Daṇḍin, and Bāṇa in conversation with the Kashmiri works that use the term *kathā* in their titles. While the theorization of Daṇḍin attempts—and ultimately fails—to provide a definition that crosses temporal and spatial boundaries,[39] the literary awareness of these Kashmiri texts is bound to a reading and transformation of the earlier *kathā* material.

While modern scholars have noted the disconnect between the theorists' idea of *kathā* and the actual content and form of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā*-s,[40] the real disconnect between *kathā* as a genre in the cosmopolitan imagination of *alaṃkāraśāstra* and how "*kathā*" appears in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is never addressed. It is clear that that the *kathā* of the *alaṃkārasāstrin*-s and the *kathā* of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* are two distinct categories. However, I'd argue, the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* directly engages with the cosmopolitan *kathā* and transforms it. That is to say, the term "*kathā*" used in the title of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* deliberately calls to mind a certain widely known and theorized body of texts, which acts as the source material, the raw stuff out of which the new literary expression is fashioned.

To give a brief working definition, the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* is a specific literary genre of *śloka*-based texts that retell or reformulate earlier stories or works. Within this general rubric, a number of famous texts can be included: Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra* (9th c.), Kṣemendra's epitomes like the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, *Bhāratamañjarī*, and *Avadānakalpalatā* (10th c.), Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and perhaps even religious and mythological texts like Jayadratha's *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* or

---

[37] See Stein's introduduction to his translation of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 11, especially footnote 5. For the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and its place in Kashmiri literary history, see Luther Obrock, "Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and the Development of a Kashmiri Style," in *Highland Philology: Results of a Text-Related Kashmir Panel at the 31st DOT, Marburg, 2010*, ed. Roland Steiner (Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittemburg, 2012).
[38] See Stein, introduction, 11 and his Note 5.
[39] It should be noted that Daṇḍin himself took part in the proliferation of art-prose. Famous for his *Daśakumāracarita* (recently translated by Isabelle Onians as *What Ten Young Men Did*), he also wrote another, now fragmentary work, the *Avantisundarī*. This work is also termed a *kathā* in its epitome, the *Avantisundarīkathāsāra*. See Onians's introduction to *What Ten Young Men Did* (2005): 24-25 and Daṇḍin, *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* (Madras [Chennai]: Kuppuswami Research Institute, 1957).
[40] Again, S. K. De dismisses them from his discussion of theorized *kathā*. In doing so he implicitly denies these Kashmiri *kathā*-based forms any sort of generic coherence; the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is for him simply a naïve use of the term.

the anonymous *Mokṣopāya*.[41] These texts proliferated in the Valley from the ninth century onward and continued to exert influence in the literary culture of the later fifteenth-century Sultanate court.[42] While I leave the exact extent of this genre a bit loose here, it seems obvious that the explosion of such texts in Kashmir and in such rapid succession shows their powerful force in the cultural imagination of the Valley.

Abhinanda's ninth-century *Kādambarīkathāsāra* is the most important model for Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*—and the work that stands as exemplary for the creation of the *ślokakathā* genre in ninth century Kashmir. This text is an epitome of Bāṇa's seventh-century prose romance entitled the *Kādambarī* and develops an important set of formal and stylistic characteristics. While the *śloka*-based metric and a certain literary register are common and important markers, the most radical literary innovation of the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* is the implicit source criticism contained within the genre.[43] The *Kathāsaritsāgara* takes and develops the *Kādambarīkathāsāra*'s formal and stylistic innovation and develops them further.

A close reading of the title of Somadeva's work can show the dense web of connections in which the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is embedded. The word *kathā* in the context of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is normally understood as to be a truncated form of "*Bṛhatkathā*." Thus the title is read as "The Ocean of the Rivers of the *Bṛhatkathā*." This meaning would be unsatisfactory for those who see the *Kathāsaritsāgara* as a simplified retelling, given that if the rivers are associated with the *Bṛhatkathā*, the ocean would be Somadeva's work, one which accommodates and includes, but is in fact greater than the rivers. Another possibility is to take the term *kathā* simply to mean "story" generically, thus the rivers flow into the ocean which can either be the *Bṛhatkathā* or the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. A final reading could be to take *kathā* as a genre term, referring to texts that had gained a prominent and contested place in the imagining of Sanskrit literary culture.

The literary and theoretical work of the Kashmiri polymath Kṣemendra shows a tacit recognition of the *ślokakathā* genre. While there is no explicit theorization of a genre in the same way as in Daṇḍin's work, still each of these writers refer specifically to the first *ślokakathā* text, Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra*, and offer some sort of understanding of literary parameters to its understanding. While these theorizations speak to Abhinanda and his *Kādambarīkathāsāra*, the general contours of their arguments remain pertinent for Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* as well.

The most obvious feature of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* is its usage of the thirty-two syllable *śloka* meter. While the *śloka* is often the quotidian workhorse meter of choice for Sanskrit, the *ślokakathā*-s elevate it to the status of high art. Kṣemendra notices this

---

[41] The literary form of the *Mokṣopāya* has begun to be studied by members of team critically editing and translating the work based in Halle, Germany.

[42] I discuss this in reference to Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* in Chapter Six of the present dissertation.

[43] For a more thorough presentation of the issue of stylistics, see Whitney Cox's investigation of Kalhaṇa's literary consciousness in Cox, "Literary Register." I have written more on metrics, translation, and the form of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* in my investigation of the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* in Obrock "Abhinanda's *Kadambarīkathāsāra*."

feature of the *śloka* in the third chapter of his *Suvṛttatilaka*, a practical handbook on the use of metrics. In a verse he lays out the use and propriety of the *anuṣṭubh* or *śloka* meter:

> *ārambhe sargabandhasya kathāvistarasaṃgrahe |*
> *śamopadeśavṛttānte santaḥ śaṃsanty anuṣṭubham ||3.16||*
> *[...]*
> *kathāprasaṅge yathābhinandasya*
> *tasyāṃ nijabhujodyogavijitārātimaṇḍalaḥ |*
> *ākhaṇḍala iva śrīmān rājā śūdraka ity abhūt ||[44]*

> Experts approve of the *anuṣṭubh* meter at the beginning of a *sargabandha* [=*mahākāvyas*], in abridgements of the vast contents of *kathā* (*kathāvistarasaṃgrahe*), and in accounts of either conciliation (*śama*) or instruction (*upadeśa*).
> […]
> In reference to *kathā*, [there is the verse] of Abhinanda:
> There was a king, illustrious like Indra, called Śūdraka, who had a territory on [the earth] conquered from his enemies through the effort of his own arms.

Regarding the Kashmiri *ślokakathā*, this reference recognizes a specific genre, here called *kathāvistarasaṃgraha*, which Kṣemendra recognizes as a valid and separate literary pursuit.[45] I have been unable to locate any further references to the term *kathāvistarasaṃgraha*,[46] but it seems very likely that Kṣemendra's own retellings of epic and Buddhist narratives might be so described. It also seems clear that Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* can also be encompassed in this term.

This brief history of the *ślokakathā* genre shows that around the second millennium Kashmiri writers developed a new genre based on the reading of *kathā* literature. The *ślokakathā* provided a form to transform—and perhaps even "vernacularize"—pan-Indic *kathā* literature. As the next section will show, it is clear that Somadeva was strongly influenced by this mode of reading the past and this method of producing new tellings of texts. This interplay between *kathā* as source and *ślokakathā* as product informs Somadeva's literary sensibility and provides a powerful model for creating particularly Kashmiri Sanskrit imaginations of the literary past.

---

[44] Kṣemendra, *Suvṛttatilaka*, in *Kṣemendra Studies: Text with English Translation,* trans. by Suryakanta (Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Prakashan, 2010): 110-111.

[45] Suryakanta translates the compound as "[a work] where a long theme is summarized" Kṣemendra, *Kṣemendra Studies*, 199-200.

[46] However, this phrase does show a close resemblance the *Kathāsaritsāgara'*s *granthavistarasaṃkṣepa* "abridgment of the extent of the book." This term will be discussed in the next section, but it seems clear that Somadeva and Kṣemendra are speaking about similar processes which can be localized to the beginning of the second millennium in Kashmir.

2.3. Somadeva and Textual History

The last section showed the broad canvas of pan-Indic *kathā* and the specific imagination and transformation of it within a Kashmiri literary space. From this broader picture, I turn to Somadeva's own words defining and delimiting his literary project. The opening verses of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* show a remarkable awareness of the Kashmiri literary tradition and the mechanics of writing a *ślokakathā*. Reading Somadeva's own apologia offers insights into the processes of textual transmission and translation. Although the introductory verses of Somadeva have recently begun to be read in far more astute ways,[47] scholarship on Somadeva often provided extremely literal readings of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and its contents. In this section, I show that a word-for-word understanding of the introduction does not do justice to the deep contextualizations Somadeva's work engenders.

Much scholarship on the *Kathāsaritsāgara* explains Somadeva's project as nothing more than a retelling of the older *Bṛhatkathā* tradition. Somadeva's is often treated as a textual witness in a positivistic text-critical analysis to recover the "original" *Bṛhatkathā*. In his introduction, Somadeva famously states:

> *yathā mūlaṃ tathaivatan na manāg apy atikramaḥ |*
> *granthavistarasaṃkṣepamātraṃ bhāṣā ca bhidyate ||1.10||*

> As the source text (*mūlaṃ*) so much [is written here], without even a tiny
> bit of deviation. There is only an abridgment of the extent of the book,
> and the language is different.

Somadeva states that the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is a translation; further, not only is it a translation, it is an extremely faithful translation. However such an understanding fails to read this work in its context, and reads in modern ideas of literal translation. Somadeva speaks to a set of conventions and expectations as he creates his new work. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* is not a witness of a textual transmission, rather it is a self-conscious reworking of textual material into a new form. Somadeva's work is not radical in this regard, rather it is part of a particularly Kashmiri literary sensibility developing in the Valley.

This reading challenges the common way of conceptualizing the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and its sources, since Somadeva's pronouncement has been understood literally to indicate a stemmatic textual history for the work. In such a view, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is a recension of an original collection of stories called the *Bṛhatkathā*, or the "Great Story". This "Great Story" was originally written, or collected, or propagated by a certain, perhaps legendary, Guṇāḍhya. The *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* of Buddhasvāmin, the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* of Kṣemendra, and the *Vāsudevahiṇḍī* are all textual descendants of the original *Bṛhatkathā*. In positivistic, philologically-oriented

---

[47] My own reading of Somadeva's introduction owes much to the important work of Janet Um's "Crossing the Ocean" and Whitney Cox's "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness." I refer the reader to Um in particular for an overview of the text and its issues.

studies of the *Bṛhatkathā*, the different tellings of the story are seen as analogous to different manuscripts. Thus the text can be grouped into recensions (the Kashmiri, the Northern, etc.) In such a way a stemmatic relationship between various versions can be mapped.

Such a viewpoint assumes that stories move in ways analogous to manuscripts, and gives the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and Somadeva the relationship of textual witness and scribe. Indeed, what is labeled on the stemmatic diagram as the Kashmiri recension is incredibly different in structure, to say nothing of style and emphasis. Further, such a reading occludes the historical boundedness of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and denies Somadeva any real agency. I focus on a particular part of Somadeva's text, the introductory chapter, called the *Kathāpīṭha* or the "Seat of Story". From a Maasian text-critical perspective this portion should be entirely excised, since it appears only in the Kashmiri versions of the *Bṛhatkathā* — Somadeva's text and Kṣemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* — and gets the largest extent and emphasis in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. From my perspective, this is the most interesting, funniest, and most densely interwoven section of Somadeva's text, and since it lays out Somadeva's imagination of the text's history, the most deserving of attention.

Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* clearly lays out its the translational element; After an invocation of the gods Śiva, Pārvatī, and Gaṇeśa (vss. 1-2), he provides a statement of purpose while praising the goddess speech. He writes:

> *praṇamya vācaṃ niḥśeṣapadārthoddyotadīpikām |*
> *bṛhatkathāyāḥ sārasya saṃgrahaṃ racayāmy aham ||1.3||*

> After paying homage to [the Goddess] Speech, the lamp that illuminates everything without exception/the lamp that illuminates the meanings of all words without exception, I compose (*racayāmi*) the abridgement (*saṃgraha*) of the essence of the *Bṛhatkathā*.

This single verse foregrounds the textual genealogy of the *ślokakathā* works. Note Somadeva's use of the terms *sārā* (essence) and *saṃgraha* (abridgement) calling to mind Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and Kṣemendra's theorization of the genre in his *Suvṛttatilaka*. Somadeva also uses the interesting verb *racayāmi* from the verbal root √*rac*, with its connotations of fashioning, ordering, and crafting. After providing a table of contents for the entirety of his work, he further explicates his translational methodology. He introduces his compositional project with the following lines (I include the verses I had already quoted above to put them in the context of Somadeva's translational argument):

> *yathā mūlaṃ tathaivatan na manāg apy atikramaḥ |*
> *granthavistarasaṃkṣepamātraṃ bhāṣā ca bhidyate ||1.10||*
> *aucityānvayarakṣā ca yathāśakti vidhiyate |*
> *kathārasāvighātena kāvyāṃśasya ca yojanā ||1.11||*
> *vaidagdhakhyātilobhāya mama naivāyam udyamaḥ |*
> *kiṃ tu nānākathājālasmṛtisaukaryasiddhaye ||1.12||*

As the source text (*mūlaṃ*) so much [is written here], without even a bit of deviation. There is only an abridgment of the extent of the book, and the language is different. Further, as far as I was able, I kept the order and the propriety (*aucitya*) and used a bit of poetry (*kāvyāṃśa*) so as not to destroy the *rasa* of the story (*kathārasa*). This undertaking of mine is not in any way out of greed to be famous as clever, rather it is for ease in remembering the web of many stories.

The parallelism between Somadeva's *granthavistarasaṃkṣepa*- "abridgment of the extent of the book" and Kṣemendra's previously discussed term *kathāvistarasaṃgraha* "abridgements of the extent of *kathā*" encodes his particular translational methodology, one which underlies most of this Kashmiri genre, as reflection on the preceding literary tradition. While many Kashmiri texts share similar introductions,[48] here it is worth noting how Somadeva conceptualizes his translation within a web of Kashmiri intellectual culture.

He begins with a declaration of identity between his source and his work, declaring that there is no deviation (*na manāg atikramaḥ*) and that the only difference is language. Although seemingly straightforward and honest, Somadeva's pronouncement immediately begs qualification. Modern translation theory constantly reminds us that word for word equivalences are an impossibility and that absolute fidelity is a fantasy. One thousand years before such theories and within a different cultural sphere Somadeva too implicitly recognizes the problematic nature of translation. Immediately after his bold statement of translational fidelity, Somadeva turns to the factors that constrain and inform the actual construction of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. The next *śloka*s contain a fascinating glimpse into the poetic forces Somadeva sees acting upon his work. I briefly call attention to the terms *aucitya*, *kathārasa*, and *kāvyāṃśa*. Somadeva's usage of these words is loaded and a brief sketch of the possible literary connections encoded within them can begin to outline some of the intellectual-historical conversations in which the *Kathāsaritsāgara* takes part.

The term *aucitya*, meaning something like "propriety," became an essential—and debated—concept in Kashmiri literary history. The invocation of the principle of *aucitya* serves a double purpose: firstly it highlights the artistic mediation involved in the creation of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and secondly it contains a somewhat tongue-in-cheek reference

---

[48] Many of the examples of Kashmiri *kathā* literature include such translational statements. Śrīvara for instance includes such a statement at the beginning of his *Kathākautuka*, itself a translation of Abdur Rahmān Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*:

krameṇa yena bhautārtho mallājyāmena varṇitaḥ |
tenaiva hi mayā so' yam ślokenādya nirūpyate ||*1.3*||

In whatever order the root meaning (*bhautārthaḥ*) was depicted by Mullah Jāmī, in the very same order is it reproduced (*nirūpyate*) in verse by me.

The *Kathākautuka* and the particular choices Śrīvara makes in its composition will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Seven of the present dissertation.

to earlier Kashmiri *ślokakathā* texts and literary theories. In his volume *Studies on Some Concepts of the Alaṃkāra Śāstra*, V. Raghavan devotes an entire chapter to *aucitya* and its role in the systemization of aesthetic theory in India. While Raghavan's argument takes a totalizing view of the tradition from the *Nāṭyaśāstra* to later second millennium intellectuals, the crux of his argument comes when dealing with Kashmiri intellectuals from around the turn of the millennium. Raghavan argues that *aucitya* becomes linked to *dhvani*, or suggestion in an important way. Raghavan gives most of the credit to the Kashmiri theoreticians Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta for this insight, but in reality its most clear expounder is the tenth century polymath Kṣemendra, also writing in the Valley. Kṣemendra wrote an entire work called the *Aucityavicāracarcā*, which sets up propriety as the life (*jīvita*) of poetry.[49] For Kṣemendra *aucitya* mediates between the poetic subject matter and the realization of the poetic savor of *rasa*. By referring to *aucitya*, Somadeva immediately invokes a methodology of poetic appropriation and transformation.

While the reference to *aucitya* serves to underline a specific imagination of textual transformation, it also calls to mind a specific Kashmiri genealogy of texts. As was stated earlier, Kṣemendra literally wrote the book on *aucitya*. He also wrote his own version of the *Bṛhatkathā* story entitled the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*. While their tellings are often more structurally similar to one another than to other instantiations of the tale, they are markedly different in scope and language. Somadeva here explicitly invokes Kṣemendra's own theoretical concept while undertaking to redo and displace his previous telling. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* then cleverly nods to the processes of reading, critique, and rewriting which underlie the genre.

Somadeva invokes similar processes throughout this introduction. When he uses the term *kathārasa* he is explicitly linking the experience of *rasa* to the idea of the *kathā*. C. H. Tawney translates *kathārasa* as "spirit of the stories"[50] while Arshia Sattar translates the same as "essence of the stories."[51] In both cases the technical but widespread valence of the term *rasa* as a term of the sensitive aesthetic experience is completely elided. Absent also is any contextual understanding of the term *kathā* as pointing to specific genre concerns in the creation of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Here again it seems to me probable that when Somadeva speaks of not doing violence (*avighātena*) to the *rasa* of the *kathā*, he is speaking of a specific way of treating the source material. Again one should recall Donald Nelson's insight that the Kashmiri tellings of the *Bṛhatkathā* seem very different in content and structure than those preserved in the Tamil, Prakrit, and other Sanskrit versions. Here Somadeva holds up the *rasa* of his source as being the primary aspect to be preserved, and more than that, it is the *rasa* of the *kathā*, the original source. Such an understanding allows for a selective and creative telling of the material, and the freedom to shape it in new and creative ways, while

---

[49] Throughout his opening stanzas, Kṣemendra places *aucitya* and *kāvya* in a somewhat complex relationship. Perhaps the clearest statement comes when he writes: *aucityaṃ rasasiddhasya sthiraṃ kāvyasya jīvitam*. Raghavan insightfully notes that this life (*jīvita*) of poetry is not to be confused with the soul (*ātman*) of poetry, which Kṣemendra seems to hold to be *rasa*.

[50] See *The Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara*, 2.

[51] See Sattar, introduction, 1.

hearkening back to the codified ideas of the affective poetic experience with the deployment of the term *rasa*.

Finally is the fascinating and evocative term *kāvyāṃśa*. While this too has been understood in a variety of ways,[52] here I argue again that Somadeva encodes an argument for a specific placement of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Somadeva states that he deploys (*yojanā*) this *kāvyāṃśa* in order not to do violence to the *rasa* of the *kathā*. Here the term seems to mean more than "portions of the poem" as Tawney somewhat loosely construes it. (This is grammatically unsatisfactory given that the word portion is in the singular in the Sanskrit.) I would rather read it as meaning that Somadeva makes use "of a portion of poetry" meaning that he looks toward *kāvya* models for some, but not all, of the stylistic and aesthetic inspiration of the work. Somadeva gives *kāvya*, the cosmopolitan genre par excellence in Sanskrit literary culture, a place within its construction, but it is relegated to a partial or secondary role. This does not mean that *kāvya* has become unimportant, rather it means it has become one competing voice among many, and that Somadeva now has a variety of models to look to when synthesizing his own version of the *Bṛhatkathā* and is not bound to any specific set of literary expectations.

Somadeva thus places his *Kathāsaritsāgara* between various literary pulls. In this brief section his verses hint toward the complex set of negotiations underlying the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. In creating his great *ślokakathā*, Somadeva looks toward the poetic past of his source, the genealogies of Kashmiri authors, and to the philosophical concepts undergirding literary production in the Valley. Reading Somadeva's introduction in light of the complex and multifarious literary world of eleventh century Kashmir can begin to shed light on the process of text building in the Valley. These few verses show the thought processes behind creating a translational and source-critical work in second millennium Kashmir.

2.4. Totality and Fragmentation in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*

> Really, universally, relations stop nowhere, and the exquisite problem of
> the artist is eternally but to draw, by a geometry of his own, the circle
> within which they shall happily *appear* to do so.[53]

The previous two sections have outlined Somadeva's mining of past literature for themes, structures, and vocabulary. His reading and transformation of *kathā* literature forms the basis for the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and his introduction shows a careful positioning of this work in a constellation of literary concepts including *kāvya*, *kathā*, and *aucitya*. While the past two sections showed the literary ecology of eleventh century Kashmir in which Somadeva placed his work, in this final section I will look at the imagined literary world Somadeva creates for the *Bṛhatkathā*'s transmission in the real world. In the first chapter of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Somadeva explores the idealized world of Sanskrit literary history as the Great Story moves from teller to teller and empire to empire across the imagined historical landscape of South Asia. I argue that Somadeva's fixation on the

---

[52] C. H. Tawney translates *kāvyāṃśa* as "portions of the poem" (*Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara*, 2). Arshia Sattar completely ignores it.

[53] Henry James, preface to *Roderick Hudson*, Preface, 5. Emphasis in the original.

Bṛhatkathā in the Sanskritic past presents an inchoate historiography of text and transmission.

Somadeva's account of the *Bṛhatkathā*'s transmission—in which his own text is tacitly included—creates a totalizing vision of the Sanskritic literary world. The first section of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, titled the *Kathāpīṭha* tells the coming of the *Bṛhatkathā* into the world, from the mouth of god to the literature of humanity. The *Kathāpīṭha* sets the tale in a specific network of relations which I read as a type of literary history in that he describes and circumscribes a world where texts move and act. Following the logic of the text itself, I position *Kathāpīṭha* as central to Kashmiri text criticism and historiography. In a way reminiscent of Henry James's "geometry", Somadeva delimits an imagined space of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and outlines a system of relations as encompassing the historical, geographical, and literary, which presents a totalizing vision of Sanskritic culture. However this totalizing vision is presented in a localized and localizable idiom of eleventh-century Kashmir.

The *Kathāpīṭha* provides a map for the historically imagined Sanskritic world, circumscribing the Ganges plain and the Vindhyā Mountains, centering the action between the poles of Pāṭaliputra in the Nanda East with Pratiṣṭhāna in the Sātavāhana West. In addition, the great grammarians of the Sanskrit tradition appear as reborn demigods, each propagating the *Bṛhatkathā*. In such a way the spread and systemization of the Sanskrit language is tied to Śiva's plan for the dissemination of the Great Story across North India. That the grammarians and empires of an imagined past occur anachronistically together and on the same footing shows that the constitution of the *Bṛhatkathā* is placed in the fluid context of an emerging Sanskritic order.

It is important to stress that these themes are not features of an original, pan-Indian *Bṛhatkathā* urtext—this section is much shorter or missing entirely from other tellings of the *Bṛhatkathā*. The account contained in the *Kathāpīṭha* does not occur in Budhasvāmin's Nepali version *Bṛhatkathāslokasaṃgraha*, nor in either Tamil or Prakrit tellings,[54] and in comparison to Kṣemendra's approximately two hundred-verse rendition of the Great Story's coming into the world in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, Somadeva's *Kathāpīṭha* is much more fully realized in more than eight hundred verses. Why then does this placement of the text in an imagined North India receive so much attention in the Kashmiri tellings? Further why does Somadeva spend so much time and effort on the *Kathāpīṭha* in his *Kathāsaritsāgara* in his eleventh-century literary context?

To turn to the contents of the *Kathāpīṭha* in more detail, the outermost frame (besides that of Somadeva as compiler, translator, and author) is that of an immense tale told by Śiva to Pārvatī. One night, the goddess Pārvatī demands to hear a tale of the Vidyādharas (a kind of demigod) since the gods are always happy and humans are always miserable. Śiva acquiesces to her demands and promises to tell her a story that no one

---

[54] For a discussion of the *Bṛhatkathāslokasaṃgraha*, see E. P. Maten, *Budhasvāmin's Bṛhatkathāslokasaṃgraha: A Literary Study of an Ancient Indian Narrative* (Leiden: Brill, 1973). Nelson remarks on this fact in his study of the Tamil versions of the *Bṛhatkathā* and the Prakrit *Vasudevahiṃḍi* and seems to follow Lacôte's analysis which posited an intermediary Paiśācī text from which the later Kashmiri versions descended. No matter the case, it is interesting that only the Kashmiri texts seem interested in telling the story of the *Bṛhatkathā*'s own textualization.

had ever heard before. While Śiva is narrating the tale, one of his attendants, Puṣpadanta, overhears it and runs home to tell it in its entirety to his wife, who happens to be a handmaiden of Pārvatī. The next day, she in turn tells the story her husband had told her to Pārvatī. The goddess is incensed that even her lowly handmaid knows the supposedly one-of-a-kind tale previously told her by Śiva and angrily confronts her husband. Śiva for his part sees what has happened and curses Puṣpadanta, along with his friend, Mālyavān, who tries to intercede on his behalf, to be born on earth. From its very first moments, the tale is tangled in its transmission and reception.

Śiva's curse, like all curses, has conditions: in brief, the price for telling the tale that should not have been told is to tell it to everyone. As they seek to propagate the *Bṛhatkathā* far and wide, the reborn *gaṇa*-s meet one another and remember their true identity. This drama of seeking and recognition happens across a swathe of imagined South Asian political and intellectual history. The field in which the unrealized reborn *gaṇa*-s must act is the remembered Nanda and Sātavāhana empires. The intrigues of the political realm are actually secondary to the intrigues of the Sanskrit grammatical order: the system of Pāṇini confronts that of the Kātantra and the Aindra system. Each of these developments is contextualized and "historicized" to certain characters: for instance Puṣpadanta becomes Vararuci a.k.a. Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vārttikās* on Pāṇini's grammar, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and Mālyavān becomes Guṇāḍhya, the supposed author of the Paiśacī *Bṛhatkathā*.

Why is such a strange meditation on the development of rival systems of grammar in long-eclipsed political structures an endemic feature in Somadeva and the "Kashmiri recension" of the *Bṛhatkathā*? And why the emphasis on the inevitability of transformation? Along its course the *Bṛhatkathā* continually transforms; the "original" suffers ruptures, translations, and at least one near annihilation. The answer to these questions might be suggested in the final segment of the *Kathāpīṭha*. Guṇāḍhya's specific limitation is that he is unable to speak in the languages of gods or men, and is reduced to using Paiśacī, the language of the ghouls. Unable to tell the story in an acceptable language, he writes the entirety of the text out on manuscript leaves in his own blood and, after reading each leaf aloud, throws it into the fire. As he weeps, the Great Tale is about to perish forever.

Miraculously some of Guṇāḍhya's manuscripts are saved from the fire by the Sātavāhana king, but the entirety of Śiva's story is not saved; only one seventh of the original total tale can be told as the *Bṛhatkathā*.[55] The *Bṛhatkathā* so emboxed becomes

---

[55] Sanskrit is by no means devoid of such theorizations of irrecoverable loss. We can perhaps trace this notion of the lost original and the surviving fragment back to the Vedic literature. *Ṛg Veda* 1.164.45 states that only one fourth of the total corpus is revealed on earth while the rest resides among the gods, the larger portion remains in occultation. (A similar idea is articulated in the case of the primordial *puruṣa* at RV 10.90.3.) In the logic of these Vedic passages, the totality of revelation is not available to humans. The *Kāmasūtra* too begins by stating how a massive text on all worldly life spoken by Prajāpati in 100,000 chapters came, through various instantiations and tellings to appear in the highly truncated version offered by Vātsyāyana. In this way, the beginning of the *Kāmasūtra* nods toward an original comprehensive (and divine) textual totality, which

only a fragment of an original lost totality, and, what is more, it is subject to further transmission and change, in that it must, by virtue of its existence outside of the languages of humans, be translated. Somadeva's introductory dictum now becomes more telling, in that by the very logic of Somadeva's own text the *Bṛhatkathā* has already been subject to much textual transformation and violence, and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* acknowledges and takes part in that process of transmission and transformation.

While sources regarding the production of texts in twelfth-century Kashmir are practically non-existent, I offer the conjecture that the placement of works within an imagined history and geography becomes more and more important in early first millennium Kashmir. While a larger study of methodologies of situating texts among Kashmiri intellectuals has never been undertaken,[56] in the case of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* it seems that Somadeva draws on and expands the practices of adoption and transformation made possible by the *ślokakathā* genre after *Kādambarīkathāsara* of Abhinanda. As we will see, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* imagines a world of texts and transmission, constantly in flux and constantly in motion, finally reaching stability in the transformative power of the poet. Such an imagination is essential to the development of a Kashmiri text criticism.

Perhaps along with the rise of new genres of translation and transformation, a concomitant mediation on loss, change, and disruption becomes more interesting in Kashmir. Textual transmission, change, and possible loss become important topics for Kashmiri intellectuals around the turn of the first millennium. A generation or two before the composition of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and Kṣemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, the great literary scholar and tantric exegete Abhinavagupta also provided a guide to understanding the way in which divine scripture comes to be manifest in the world. His *Tantrāloka* stands as the foremost exegetical work on Kashmiri Tantric theory and practice, and its influence in the realm of Śaivism cannot be overestimated. While this work has been mined for information on Tantric ritual and philosophy, its short and enigmatic chapter 36 has rarely been discussed. In the fifteen verses that make up this section, Abhinavagupta theorizes how Śaiva scripture, *āgama*, can come into the world.

The parallel between the *Kathāpīṭha* of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and chapter 36 of the *Tantrāloka* is telling. Both speak of an original text from god spoken to a goddess, both show the transmission through semi-divine beings (on the part of Somadeva, the *gaṇa*-s, on the part of Abhinavagupta, the *siddha*-s, etc.), they also, interestingly enough, both highlight the inescapability of loss in the descent of God's words to earth. While further research is needed to map out the text-critical *zeitgeist* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Kashmir, the parallels between these disparate fields are striking.

---

has been subjected to processes of abridgment and edition. I would like to thank Robert Goldman for pointing out these parallels.

[56] It should however be noted that early second millennium Kashmir presents an especially interesting archive for understanding ways of situating texts and ideas. To give just two twelfth-century examples in different genres, Ruyyaka's *Alaṃkārasarvasva* begins with a sort of history of the philosophy of aesthetics and Maṅkha's *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* places itself with certain family and social circles in the Valley. A careful study of history and place in such texts can help further complicate the relationship between cosmopolitan language and regional textual practices.

The idea of textual totality in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is played against the idea of historical totality. An imagined entirety of Sanskritic political and intellectual life plays a role in the creation of the story. This drive towards totality in the rich contextual text is denied for the actual content of the text, the fragmentariness of the tale-to-be-told is emphasized. Indeed there is a tacit denial of the possibility that it could ever be complete. Here we can perhaps return to Abhinava, and the fate of Śiva's words in the world. All words from god are already truncated, and their totality is irrecoverable. By framing the *Bṛhatkathā* in the same way as revealed texts like Abhinava's *āgama*-s, an imaginative space is opened. By denying its material totality the non-closed quality of the work is emphasized. Indeed, how could a work be *the* Great Story if it had a clearly delimited beginning and end?

In this light, I think a certain playfulness can be read in Somadeva's "serious" statement of translational validity. The idea of "translation" in Kashmiri *kathā* texts needs to be informed by the practices the texts themselves; here especially in the context of the *Bṛhatkathā* in Kashmir such an obvious and skilled conceptualization of texts in their totality in the world and begins to show the contours of a textual-historical imagination. Somadeva's expression *granthavistarasaṃkṣepamātraṃ*, in which the expanse (*vistara*) of the text is played against its edited abridgement (*saṃkṣepa*) can be read in light of the story told in the *Kathapīṭha* as a statement of Somadeva's own role in the history of the text.

2.5. Conclusion: The *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*

Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* stands as the culmination of a specifically Kashmiri way of writing—the *ślokakathā*. In his elegant use of the *anuṣṭubh* meter Somadeva retells and recasts the *Bṛhatkathā* in a new and powerful idiom. The style of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*'s telling is coupled with a boldly self-confident sort of textual criticism, which includes both knowledge of literary history and an awareness of its own placement it. Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* shows the maturity of a specifically Kashmiri way of writing and as such may be taken as an exemplar of a certain sort of Kashmiri vernacular Sanskrit.

While Somadeva himself looks back to the great Kashmiri writers of the past, most notably Abhinanda and his *Kādambarīkathāsāra*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* serves as a model to be used, emulated, and appropriated by later Kashmiri authors. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* became central to the way certain texts were constructed and structured in Kashmir, especially the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa. As Sanskrit literature adapted to new contexts, the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* tradition and its foremost practitioner Somadeva provided not only a form, but also an underlying self-awareness to Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka*.

This chapter reiterated that texts do not appear out of an intellectual or historical vacuum, rather they carefully read and react to what preceded them. In the case of Somadeva, he looked toward the pan-Indian *kathā* tradition and the previous generations of "translators." Two of these pioneers of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā*, Abhinanda and Kṣemendra, provided the basic form and methodology for the creation of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. This *sloka*-based form will provide the basic form for all later texts discussed in this dissertation.

Yet the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* does not totally adhere to the *ślokakathā* form of the *Kathāsaritsāgara,* rather Kalhaṇa adopts and expands Somadeva's underlying methodology in his *Rājataraṅgiṇī.* Reading the *Kathāsaritsāgara* as an actively translational project can illuminate the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s own source criticism as a transformational historiography. Further, Somadeva's placement of terms like *kathā*, *rasa*, and *kāvya* in his own understanding can provide some insight on how these terms were deployed in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī.* Careful attention to mechanics of translation and reproduction in Somadeva provide a vocabulary to describe the power and limitations of later historiographies in the Valley.

In the end, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*'s self-conscious source criticism supplies the basic literary and theoretical building blocks for Kashmiri historiography. In such a way the *Kathāsaritsāgara* provided a model to be borrowed and an idiom to be emulated by Kalhaṇa in his *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and even later by Śrīvara in his translation of Jāmī's Persian *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā* in his *Kathākautuka.* The same negotiations between source and product, content and form, and will be mediated through different types of adaption, adoption, and translation. The strategies provided in Somadeva's text provide the basis for what I will argue is a "vernacular" Kashmiri Sanskrit which continues in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and flourishes during the Shāh Mīrī Sultanate. In the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Somadeva showed the power the elastic *ślokakathā* genre, in the coming chapter we will see how Kalhaṇa took the potential Somadeva realized even further to create a new sort of historiography.

Chapter 3: Toward a Kashmiri Historiography

3.1 Introduction: Reading Kalhaṇa Reading the Past: The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and Its Influences

      The eighty years or so between the presentation of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* to Ananta's queen Sūryamatī and Kalhaṇa's present (the twenty-second year of King Jayasiṃha's reign, ca. 1149-50) were filled with political upheaval—the madness of king Harṣa caused the collapse of the First Lohara Dynasty in 1101, and their distant cousins established their own Second Lohara Dynasty only after much bloodshed. Against this historical background, twelfth-century Kashmir saw the appearance of Kalhaṇa, of one of the most idiosyncratic and memorable voices in the history of Sanskrit literary culture. In his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Kalhaṇa creates a new type of literature, a new way of narrating the past and the present. His *Rājataraṅgiṇī* fashions a powerful literary historiography that exerted an unprecedented pull on the later Kashmiri historical and political imagination and was seized upon by other intellectual traditions (first the Persianate and then the European). Despite its unique place in the Sanskrit literary canon, neither Kalhaṇa nor the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* emerged out of a cultural vacuum; both the author and his work were deeply imbricated within the rich world of Kashmiri intellectual culture.

      In Kalhaṇa's massive undertaking, the poet recounts thousands of years of Kashmiri kingship in a single narrative. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* translates literally to "the River (*taraṅginī*) of Kings"[57] and describes the successive flow of events and dynasties from time immemorial to Kalhaṇa's present. Yet more than that, the "River of Kings" portrays a certain Heraclitean tension between the constancy of change and a sameness of process. In that way, the text contains within itself a metaphorical idea underlying its moral imagination: waves (*taraṅga*-s) rise and fall, carrying the fortunes of each successive king as the story progresses. Beginning in mythological time with the draining of the Satīsaras (the Lake of Satī) to create the Valley and the first settlement by humans, it continues through generation after generation and dynasty after dynasty up to its twelfth-century present. With all of its politics and strife, triumph, defeat, brilliance, and madness, Kalhaṇa's vast tale encodes a certain way of seeing and organizing the past, a particularly Kashmiri historiography.

      I investigate the nuts and bolts of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s composition, outlining the conversations into which Kalhaṇa places his poetic history. I term the particular form, vocabulary, and worldview encoded in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* a historiography for the simple reason that if one is to call Kalhaṇa a historian and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* a history, the parameters underlying such nomenclature must be made explicit. To bring Kalhaṇa within the scope of history, which itself has a specific genealogy and history within modern and western academic contexts is problematic, but I think through an act of cultural translation and explanation such a label can indeed be applied fruitfully to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, and can do more than help us interpret Kalhaṇa's view of the world; such an investigation can also offer new ways of talking about the past (and the present) in the

---

[57] The word *taraṅgiṇī* is literally "that (f.) which has [-*iṇī*] waves [*taraṅga*]." *Taraṅga* is an *aluk upapadasamāsa* built off of the word *taraṃ* (from √*tṝ*, *tarati* "to cross") plus *ga* (from √*gam*, *gacchati*, "to go").

non-modern non-West. Attempting to understand Kalhaṇa on his own terms and seriously considering the logic of historical representation in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* offers a chance to view the past through a culturally conditioned lens. Taking this worldview seriously can tell us much about the intellectual and literary life of twelfth-century Kashmir.

At the outset I must stress that Kalhaṇa's historiography is a particularly regional development. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s way of writing history is neither extendable to a historicity extant throughout Sanskritic South Asia nor conformable to a western discipline of history; rather Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* arose in Kashmir through the fortuitous coincidence of several literary precedents, and remained a very Kashmiri form with a very Kashmiri genealogy. The remainder of this chapter roots the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* both in a particularly Kashmiri geographic locale and historic moment while tracing the intellectual influences which provide the backdrop for Kalhaṇa's literary innovation. Understanding the textual ecology in which Kalhaṇa operates as well as the models which Kalhaṇa both appropriates and rejects allows us to tease out the genesis and import of this particularly Kashmiri form of historicity. Here I demarcate a place for the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, in conversation with both transregional "high" cultural forms of Sanskrit *kāvya* as well as deeply rooted in local Kashmiri forms.

The very newness of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* combined with the number of gestures toward literary precedents demand unpacking. The Kashmiri literary tradition itself recognizes the need to identify the conversations in which Kalhaṇa and his work take part. The Sanskrit poet Maṅkha describes Kalhaṇa (using the Sanskritized version of his name, Kalyāṇa[58]) in the final chapter of his *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* amid a long list of other luminaries from both inside and outside the confines of the Valley. In three verses Maṅkha provides an incisive and evocative description of our poet and hints at his place in the larger world of second millennium Sanskrit *kāvya*. Maṅkha writes:

> *śrīmān analakadatto yam analpaṃ kāvyaśilpiṣu |*
> *svapariśramasarvasvanyāsasabhyam[59] amanyata ||25.78||*
> *tathopacaskare yena nijavāṅmayadarpaṇaḥ |*

---

[58] Kālyaṇa is the proper Sanskritization of Kalhaṇa, which is itself an Apabraṃśa form. This identification is not altogether unproblematic, but Stein has laid out a convincing case for this identification in the introduction to his translation of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (see Stein, introduction, 12-14). I follow Stein when he notes: "Any possible doubt on [the identification of Maṅkha's Kālyaṇa with Kalhaṇa] must, however, give way before the evidence afforded by the close agreement we note between Maṅkha's words regarding Kalyāṇa and our previous observations regarding Kalhaṇa's literary leanings." (*ibid*., 14.) The remainder of this chapter will strengthen this identification and root Kalhaṇa more firmly in a specific Kashmiri context.

[59] *svapariśrama*- is my emendation of the edition's *svaparaśrama*-. Reading along with the edition the translation, would give the sense of "through exertion [undertaken for] himself and others." While this is perhaps plausible, it seems that such a date of purpose in a compound would expect the word *artha*; indeed *svārtha* and *parārtha* are common expressions used in compounds. I would like to thank Alexander von Rospatt for this editorial suggestion.

bilhaṇaprauḍhisaṃkrāntau yathā yogyatvam agrahīt ||25.79||
tattadbahukathākelipariśramaniraṅkuśam ||
taṃ praśrayaprayatnena kalyāṇaṃ samamīmanat ||25.80||

> The illustrious Analakadatta honored Kalyāṇa (=Kalhaṇa) whom he held
> as no small figure amongst the craftsmen of poetry (*kāvya*) civilized
> (*sabhya*) in all of his own compositions (*nyāsa*) through his own exertion,
> who polished the mirror of his own literature as it reached acceptability
> when Bilhaṇa's proud diction was transferred, [and] who was unfettered
> by the exhaustion from play within the various great stories (*kathā*).

In Maṅkha's description, Kalhaṇa is poised between two worlds: the courtly patron-centered poetry (represented here by the famed Kashmiri poet Bilhaṇa) and that of *kathā*. The *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* thus identifies two methods of literature that meet in the poet Kalhaṇa and his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. The peripatetic Bilhaṇa exemplifies one route, namely that of a skilled poet of patron-centered *kāvya* in the service of political ends.[60] On the other hand, the term *kathā*, which I read as referring to Kashmiri *ślokakathā*-s, provides a regional counterpoint to the cosmopolitan and overtly patron-centered world of Bilhaṇa.[61] Here I take Maṅkha's description seriously, and use this binary as an organizing principle for further investigation of Kalhaṇa and his project. Attention to these twinned influences of *kāvya* and *kathā* allow for a conversation that engages both regional and cosmopolitan forms. However, I must stress that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* cannot be completely subsumed into either the *kāvya* or *kathā* camp; rather Kalhaṇa's vision presents not only a new way to write history but also a new way to write literature in knowing conversation with its literary precedents.

In this chapter I provide a brief account of three of the most pertinent conversations: Firstly, I examine Kalhaṇa's adaptation of a certain stylistic register and text-critical perspective which it adopts and adapts from Somadeva and the Kashmiri *kathā* tradition. Secondly, I chart the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s relationship with cosmopolitan Sanskrit literature (especially patron-centered political poetry). To this end, I place the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in conversation with patron-centered poetry produced in Kashmir through a comparison of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s description of the reign of King Harṣa with a patron-centered encomium of the same king. I show the way in which Kalhaṇa draws upon and subverts *kāvya* expectations. Finally I look toward the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s use of *śānta rasa*,

---

[60] Yigal Bronner and Lawrence McCrea discuss the place of Bilhaṇa in the cosmopolitan and courtly world. See Bronner, "The Poetics of Ambivalence: Imagining and Unimagining the Political in Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*." *JIP* 38, 5 (2010): 457-483.and McCrea, "Poetry Beyond Good and Evil: Bilhaṇa and the Tradition of Patron-Centered Court Epic," in *JIP* 38, 5 (2010): 503-518. While taking their point that Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* is much more complex than a simplistic paean to the political might of King Vikrama, the juxtaposition of Bilhaṇa with *kathā* is striking.
[61] Whitney Cox has noticed this parallel in "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness", see especially pp. 134-135 and n. 9. Again I am indebted to Cox's analysis; this chapter in many ways hopes to further flesh out some of the insights presented in this article.

or the aesthetic sentiment of ultimate peace that comes from giving up attachment to the world. While *rasa* is rightly seen as important to the underlying imagination of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, here I argue that Kalhaṇa's use of the language of aesthetics hints toward a new type of literary consciousness. The relationship with each of these three topics underlie the literary, historical, aesthetic, and moral choices that first found expression in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and continued to inform Kashmiri historiography through the works of Śrīvara in the fifteenth century.

3.2. Kashmiri Textual History and the Making of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*

Returning to the organizing dichotomy given by Maṅkha in his *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, what exactly does Maṅkha mean when he says that Kalhaṇa is "unfettered by the exhaustion from play within the various great stories (*tattadbahukathākeli-pariśramaniraṅkuśam*)"? Here I suggest that we connect Maṅkha's use of the term *kathā* to Somadeva's use of the term in his *Kathāsaritsāgara*.[62] The parallelism of the texts points to such a shared imagined literary space. The particularly Kashmiri valence of this word is obvious from the previous discussion of Somadeva and his *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and extrapolating from Maṅkha's insight can help us understand the underpinnings of Kalhaṇa's historiography. The double valence of the word *kathā*, pointing both to the finished text as well as the source material indicates the way in which Kalhaṇa used sources and the final form in which he presented the raw stuff of history. Maṅkha's characterization is perceptive: a careful reading of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* strongly supports that Kalhaṇa drew on the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* tradition to shape the structural, stylistic, and ideological peculiarities of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Further, an investigation of *ślokakathā* elements in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* can help unpack Kalhaṇa's "source-criticism" through which he transforms the messy and disorganized flow of history into a controlled and ideologically consistent historiography in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

Formally, there are many similarities between the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Perhaps the most obvious similarity between Somadeva's vast tale and Kalhaṇa's history is the division of sections and the metaphorical framework of both of the texts. Each relies on watery and wave-related chapter divisions. For instance, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, containing in its title the words for river (*sarit*) and ocean (*sāgara*), divides its portions into *lambaka*-s, which Tawney translates as "billows", which themselves are divided into *taraṅga*-s, or waves. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is itself also divided into *taraṅga*-s. It seems clear that Kalhaṇa's usage of this terminology and organizing scheme is a nod toward Somadeva and his *Kathāsaritsāgara*, completed about one hundred years before Kalhaṇa's own work.

I must stress that this river- and ocean-based terminology serves more than just a nominal significance in Kalhaṇa's thought. In fact, it provides the fundamental metaphor that pervades the entire *Rājataraṅgiṇī*—the river of history is made up of the waves of kings and dynasties. Kalhaṇa uses the simile of a river and an ocean in the culminating

---

[62] Other readings of this compound are possible. Jonarāja, Maṅkha's fifteenth-century commentator reads *kathā* to mean "the *Mahābhārata*, etc." While this gloss is telling in its own way (we will return to it in the last section of this chapter), the Maṅkha's wording and Kalhaṇa's text suggests my understanding of the compound.

verse of his entire poem, stating that the first seven of his books are like the seven mouths of the river Godāvarī, and flowing into the eighth book which is identified with the ocean. This verse and this simile will be discussed in greater length in the following chapter, however, it is worthy of brief note here that the concluding simile of the entire work harkens back to an organizational logic which seems completely and totally taken from Somadeva's Ocean of the Rivers of Story. In his own work, Kalhaṇa refines and repurposes this organizing terminology, giving it a profound and pointed moral valence yet still the metaphorical world of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is very much present.

The resonances between the *kathā* literature and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* go deeper than just structural nomenclature or metaphorical identification. In his fascinating article "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī,* Whitney Cox shows two further levels of parallelism: stylistics and their shared episodic structure. This article offers a reading of the stylistic peculiarities of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as hearkening to the works of Abhinanda and Somadeva. He is particularly interested in the way in which Kalhaṇa uses specific syntactic structures, types of compounds and verbs, and word choice to create a certain tone, which he identifies as a shared linguistic register. He traces this tone back to the distinct style developed in the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara.* Cox also sees both the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* defined by an episodic structure, that Kalhaṇa's densely interbraided historical narrative owes much to the what he calls the *ślokakathā*-s "characteristic narrative device."[63] He further argues: "These individual narrative moments can all be seen as exemplary of wider themes, but they are equally kept distinct amidst the flow of the river of kings. In this Kalhaṇa's centuries-long connected narrative owes a clear debt to the picaresque sequences of isolable narratives… that were the building blocks of the earlier *ślokakathā*-s."[64] Cox's insight into a shared idiom and shared episodic structure deserves a much fuller study, but it seems clear that the whole *Rājataraṅgiṇī* has been deeply influenced by readings of Kashmiri *ślokakathā*-s like the *Kathāsaritsāgara.*

One need not dive into a close parallel of style, usage, or form to note strong affinities; the introduction of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* proceeds in exactly the same way. Like the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* begins with a statement of intent, outlining the sources Kalhaṇa uses to create his work and the scope and shape of his literary vision. This statement stands in clear conversation with the introduction of Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara.* After a praise of Śiva in his Ardhanārīśvara form, homage to Gaṇeśa, and three verses dedicated to good poets, Kalhaṇa states his own translational methodology. He writes:

> *kathādairghyānurodhena vaicitrye 'py aprapañcite |*
> *tadatra kiṃcid asty eva vastu yatprītaye satām ||1.6||*
> *ślāghyaḥ sa eva guṇavān rāgadveṣabahiṣkṛtā |*
> *bhūtarthakathane yasya stheyasyeva sarasvatī ||1.7||*
> *pūrvair baddhaṃ kathāvastu mayi bhūyo nibadhnati |*
> *prayojanam anākarṇya vaimukhyaṃ nocitaṃ satām ||1.8||*

---

[63] Cox, "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness," 156.
[64] *ibid*.

dṛṣṭaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ nṛpodantaṃ baddhvā pramayamīyuṣām |
arvākkālabhavair vārtā yatprabandheṣu pūryate ||1.9||
dākṣyaṃ kiyad idaṃ tasmād asmin bhūtārthavarṇane |
sarvaprakāraṃ skhalite yojanāya mamodyamaḥ ||1.10||
[…]
iyaṃ nṛpāṇām ullāse hrāse vā deśakālayoḥ |
bhaiṣajyabhūtasaṃvādikathā yuktopayujyate ||1.21||
saṃkrāntaprāktanānantavyavahāraḥ sucetasaḥ |
kasyedṛśo na saṃdarbho yadi vā hṛdayaṃgamaḥ ||1.22||

Although the manifold diversity (*vaicitrya*) [of the topic] is unable to be
treated in its fullness (*aprapañcita*) since it is hindered by the magnitude
of the story (*kathā*), still in the present [work] some basic plot (*vastu*)
exists which may please the good (*satām*)[65]. Praiseworthy is that man of
qualities whose poetic speech (*sarasvatī*), like that of a judge, remains
beyond passion and hatred when narrating the affairs of the past
(*bhūtārtha*). Even though[66] I again compose a work that was already
treated by my predecessors, it is not fitting for the good to dismiss [my
work] without [first] hearing my reasons (*prayojana*). What is the skill
required in order that men of a later time should supplement the narrative
of events in the works of those who died after composing each the history
of those kings whose contemporaries they were? Hence *my* endeavor is to
give a connected account where the narrative of past events has become
fragmentary in many respects. […][67] This narrative [of mine] which is
properly arranged and which resembles a medicine is useful where the
[accounts regarding the] place and time of kings are fluctuating (*lit.*
growing and diminishing). Or if this composition were not pleasing, for
whom would it exist?

Some scholars have identified this passage as "text-critical", or at least an
acknowledgment of sources and an awareness of a "scientific" historiographical method.
This judgment is valid in a certain way, but it ignores the particularly Kashmiri ecology
of texts in which such a statement is embedded. In its own introduction, the
Rājataraṅgiṇī hearkens back to the language and methodology of Somadeva and his
predecessors, while pushing their ideas further into uncharted territory.

Before making a definitive statement of what is novel in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, we
must understand the intellectual scaffolding underlying this introduction. Here note that,
like Somadeva in his introduction to his *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Kalhaṇa emphasizes his

---

[65] Kalhaṇa, like many other authors in their introductions (cf. for instance Abhinanda's
Kādambarīkathāsāra, vv. 8-10), addresses "the good" (*santaḥ*), which contains within it
ideas of both good ethical standing and good aesthetic judgment.
[66] I take this locative absolute to have concessive force even though it lacks the particle
api.
[67] Here Kalhaṇa details in ten verses his sources and the lacunae in those sources. These
sources include texts and genealogies as well as land and temple grants.

editing eye. Where Somadeva first sets down his claim to an objective retelling (*yathā mūlaṃ tathaivaitan na manāg apy atikramaḥ*), he then lists the factors that will serve to delimit his own telling. In the case of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Somadeva lists these factors as abridgement (*saṃkṣepa*) and language (*bhāṣā*), however, he goes on to state that a careful judgment of propriety (*aucitya*), connection (*anvaya*) will inform his editing eye, as well as an attempt not to destroy the "flavor", *rasa*, of the stories. Kalhaṇa's project must be seen as translational, actively choosing what historical information to transmit and in what manner it is to be transmitted. A reading of the beginning of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in conversation with the *Kathāsaritsāgara* shows a concerted engagement with a type of source criticism that, although more open and in-depth than Somadeva's, treats a very similar project.

Further, the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* uses the word *kathā* (and its related verbal noun *kathana*) four times in these seven verses. As the use of such marked vocabulary with its double valence shares an affinity with the word *kathā*'s usage in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. When Kalhaṇa first uses the term, it accords with the huge mass of source material, the great totalizing *kathā* of Kashmiri history. By verse 1.21, the vast totalizing *kathā* which exists within and behind all of his various sources has been appropriated and fashioned into Kalhaṇa's *kathā*, which is more than just a tale or an objective chronicle; it has both a moral existence as a medication (*bhaiṣajya*) and an aesthetic purpose (delight for scholars). These last two points differ from the world-view of Somadeva's text-critical imagination of *kathā*. However drawing upon certain shared ideas Kalhaṇa roots his historiography within indigenous Kashmiri genres.

In Kalhaṇa's play among the *kathā*-s he learned the rules of the game, a certain language, form, and vocabulary, one which he used as a scaffolding for his own new historical imagination. In Somadeva, Kalhaṇa found a model for reworking a sea of previous material, a way of ordering and controlling sources within a powerful new expressive medium. The terminology of rivers and seas, the organization, the poetic diction, and the translational methodology link the two works in close conversation. However Kalhaṇa did not slavishly adhere to the Kashmiri *kathā*'s genre; rather he drew upon, adapted, and in the end transcended its expectations.

3.3 *Kāvya*, Politics, and the Past in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*

The *kathā* influence on the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* seems apparent, yet Maṅkha's pointed reference to Bilhaṇa complicates Kalhaṇa's literary precedents. Returning to Maṅkha's characterization, he states that in the transference (*saṃkrānti*) of the boldness (*prauḍhi*) of Bilhana, Kalhaṇa's work became acceptable (*yogya*-). Taking the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*'s language seriously, the exact meanings of these terms help better frame the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s project. While *prauḍhi* or "boldness" is the most important poetic term for understanding the basis of Kalhaṇa and Bilhaṇa's similarity,[68] the term *saṃkrānti* is

---

[68] Whitney Cox has perceptively noted that Bilhaṇa himself uses the term *prauḍhi* to define poetic language—and his poetic project in the introduction to his in *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. He writes in verse 1.15:

*prauḍhiprakarṣeṇa purānarītivyatikramaḥ ślaghyatamaḥ padānām *

especially resonant; from the verbal root √*kram* "to step" with the prefix *sam* "together", the word means the stepping or coming together, and is often used in astronomical senses to mark the passage of celestial bodies from one constellation to another.[69] In this way it might not be too far of a stretch to argue that Maṅkha sees in Kalhaṇa a new way of dealing with poetry, kingship, and politics which both looks to and eclipses Bilhaṇa's famed patron-centered *mahākāvya*, the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* thus becomes the next logical step in the development of a certain type of poetry.

To turn first to the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, Bilhaṇa's famed account of the Cālukya ruler Vikrama VI has come down the present day almost by chance, yet it exerted a tremendous pull on the literary and intellectual culture of twelfth-century Kashmir. The *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* is an ornate poem in eighteen chapters that remains on of the most important fully textualized[70] encomia in the history of South Asia. While early inscriptions attest to patron-centered *kāvya* from at least the Gupta era and royal panegyrics or *praśasti*-s are found carved on rock throughout the Sanskrit cosmopolis, textual evidence for patron-centered works circulating as literature begins in the seventh century with Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*.[71] While it seems likely that other fully textualized praise-poems circulated in elite South Asian courts and *sabhā*-s, the history of such a literature must remain conjectural because so few works remain in the centuries between Bāṇa and Bilhaṇa.[72]

Whatever the larger tradition of textualized patron-centered poetry outside of the Kashmir, within the Valley itself, the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* exemplifies a patron-centered political *kāvya* in the Kashmiri literary tradition, and Bilhaṇa exemplifies the peripatetic court poet, moving from place to place searching for courtly favor through his linguistic ingenuity. Aurel Stein noticed the many affinities between Bilhaṇa's famed

---

*atyunnatisphoṭakuñcakāni vandāni kāntākucamaṇḍalāni *
The transcending of ancient style through the intensity of boldness
(*prauḍhiprakarṣa*) is what is most praiseworthy for language [lit.
"words"]. The nipples of beautiful women are extolled when their curves
pop out on account of their pertness (*prauḍhi*).

I have translated this verse slightly differently than Cox, however the main point here is that Bilhaṇa himself imagined his poetic project in terms of this poetic boldness. See Cox, "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness," 134.
[69] When read with this specifically astrological valence, it calls to mind the oft-quoted statement characterizing the relationship between Bhāravi and Māgha: *tāvat bhā bhāraveḥ bhāti yāvat māghasya nodayaḥ*, "The luster of the sun (or: the brilliance of Bhāravi) lasts up until the coming of the [winter] month of Māgha (or: until the coming of the poet Māgha)." Here again we se a sort of *saṃkrānti* as the sun enters into a new asterism, and as the preeminence of Bhāravi is trumped by that of Māgha.
[70] I use the term "textualized" to refer to works that circulated in manuscript form rather than inscriptional *praśasti*-s.
[71] Stein collects textual evidence to show that Kalhaṇa was also familiar with the Harṣacarita, see Stein's introduction, p. 11.
[72] George Buhler attempts to explain the disappearance of these *carita*-s from Sanskrit literary histories, see his introduction to his edition of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, pp. 1-2.

Vikramāṅkadevacarita and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, but did not attempt to theorize the mechanics of their literary relationship.[73] While authors such as Bronner, Cox, and McCrea have cogently argued that Bilhaṇa's patron-centered "historical" *kāvya* hides within it a bitter edge,[74] the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* does not come close to the detached, world-weary commentary on the transience of power given in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Is this the *saṃkrānti* of which Maṅkha speaks, the next logical step in the poetry of power, detaching it from patronage and highlighting the aesthetics of world-weariness whereby such a work becomes suitable (*yogya*)? I think this is one possible understanding of Kalhaṇa's remarkable transformation of the literary depiction of kings and kingship in his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

Another possibility is seeing this *saṃkrānti* in regionalized terms, the transference of Bilhaṇa's outward-looking eye brought back to Kashmir itself. Bilhaṇa was famously homesick for his native land, and his great patron-centered poem on the life and times of a ruler in the Deccan ends with a paean to Kashmir and his family.[75] Written in the *mandākrānta* meter,[76] this section recalls Kālidāsa's famous *Meghadūta*, in which the lover, separated from his beloved for the space of a year, pines for his wife and city. Bilhaṇa's recalling of this poem through his use of its distinctive meter lends to his biography a sense of longing to be placed within the history and locale of the Valley. In this way Maṅkha's verse sees Kalhaṇa bringing a certain sort of poetic genius (which Maṅkha calls *prauḍhi* or "boldness") home to Kashmir.

Here I put the writing styles of patron-centered *kāvya*, like that of Bilhaṇa and countless other *praśasti*-s in conversation with Kalhaṇa's historiography in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. As a case study, I will briefly compare two different ways of describing the same Kashmiri king, Harṣa, who ruled the Valley from 1089-1101. The first is a patron-centered encomium entitled the *Rājendrakarṇapūra* (Filling the Ears of the Best of Kings) by one Śambhukavi. Completely unstudied after its publication in the Kāvyamālā series, the poem is a fascinating example of textualized patron-centered literature in the Valley. In it Kashmir and Harṣa are imagined in this specific *kāvya* register. This will be contrasted to Kalhaṇa's own discussion of Harṣa and his construction of an account of Harṣa's history. By examining Śambhukavi in the context of Kalhaṇa, the fraught relationship between the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and certain poetic norms will be elucidated. My analysis will be one pointing to certain disjunctures between the theory and practice of *kāvya* and Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

---

[73] See Stein's introduction, p. 10-11. He gives a list of especially close seeming passages in n. 1. Such affinities deserve closer attention.

[74] See their special contributions to the *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 38, 2010.

[75] For a discussion of Bilhaṇa's memories of Kashmir and his ambivalent attitude toward the life of service in southern India, see Whitney Cox, "Saffron in the Rasam," in *South Asian Texts in History: Critical Engagements with Sheldon Pollock*, ed. by Yigal Bronner, *et al*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011).

[76] *Mandākrānta* is one of the most recognizable meters of Sanskrit. Consisting of the 17 syllable pattern - - - - ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ - | - ˘ - -˘ - - repeated 4 times, this meter is often used to describe longing and place in classical Sanskrit literature.

The reign of King Harṣa is central to both Kalhaṇa's own family history and to the construction of his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. It is in the reign of Harṣa that Kalhaṇa's family makes its first appearance with his father Caṇpaka's rise to prominence within elite circles. Perhaps the development of his own family fortunes under the reign of the king and his subsequent ignominious downfall can be psychologized as the underlying reason for Kalhaṇa's ambivalence toward the processes of history. Even with that being the case, Kalhaṇa's account of Harṣa is one of the masterpieces within the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and his treatment of Harṣa himself provide the exemplary form of his history for his ideas concerning the paradoxical nature of power itself.[77]

We turn first to the *Rājendrakarṇapūra* and the poetics of *praśasti* in medieval Kashmir. The poetics of this *praśasti* tradition has only now begun to be studied, however, when comparing this sort of "political" writing with either Western historical assumptions or the content of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* tradition it becomes clear that *praśasti*-s were operating under another set of compositional expectations, one very much in conversation with the transregional ideals laid out in *The Language of the Gods*. In these literatures kings and dynasties operate within the same referential sphere, no matter the actors or events.[78] Here the ideal series of events always shapes the historical, and the poet always avoids the real particularities of place and time.

The *Rājendrakarṇapūra* verses show the *praśasti* style of courtly praise perfected to almost baroque excess. Although this work deserves much fuller attention, I have selected three verses that I see as emblematic of the work that *praśasti* does, and illustrative of the different attitude toward kingship, history and representation when compared with the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. A typical verse in the *Rājendrakarṇapura* runs like this:

> *jahāti nagarīṃ galatkanakakaṅkaṇaḥ kauṅkaṇo*
> *vanaṃ vaśati vihvalaḥ skhalitakuntalaḥ kauntalaḥ |*
> *kim anyad krudhi tvayi mṛgendrabhīmāravaṃ*
> *taṭaṃ viśati māravaṃ cyutaramālavo mālavaḥ ||12||*

---

[77] Whitney Cox provided a close reading of the Harṣa episode from the point of view of stylistics, see "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness." Almost the entirety of the seventh *taraṅga* of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is devoted to Harṣa. Needless to say, Kalhaṇa has a very different description of Harṣa than what we find preserved in the *Rājendrakarṇapūra*. As a side note, Śambhukavi is referred to briefly in the 25th chapter of Maṅkha's *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*:
> *vavande 'tha tam ānandaṃ sutaṃ śambhumahākaveḥ ||25.97cd||*
> I then praised Ānanda, the son of the great poet Śambhu…
Unfortunately Maṅkha gives no further information other than that he was well known as a great poet (*mahākavi*).

[78] Lawrence McCrea's comparison of Bilhaṇa's patron-centered poem with the evidence from other inscriptional sources perhaps serves as an interesting parallel. Bilhaṇa strives in the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* to show Vikramāditya as a completely normative perfect king, much at odds with the Gadag inscription. See McCrea, "Poetry Beyond Good and Evil."

The king of the Konkan abandons his city, his golden bracelets (*kaṅkaṇa*) slipping off;[79] the distressed King of Kuntala dwells in the wilderness, his hair (*kuntala*) in disarray; when you are enraged, how else could it be? The King of Mālava, deprived of the last portion of his kingly splendor,[80] enters the edge of the desert (*mārava*),[81] [filled with] the terrible roaring of the lord of beasts (*mṛgendra*=lion).

In this verse, Śambhukavi cleverly embeds the name of kingdoms with symbols of subjugation. For instance the King of Kuntala's locks (*kuntala*) are in disarray because of his defeat and the Konkan king's golden bracelets (*kaṅkaṇa*) have fallen off his wrists since he is emaciated by depression. Both of these images are clichés that can be found throughout the vast corpus of Sanskrit poetry and encomia. Representation in the *Rājendrakarṇapūra* is completely determined by Sanskrit poetic convention. Here, alliteration (*anuprāsa*) and conventionalized expression trumps any sort mimetic account of political situations or power. Such a conventional description is continued in verses like the following. Śambhukavi writes:

> *aṅke keralasundarīkacabharaśyāmaṃ kalaṅkaṃ vahan*
> *mithyārohati pūrvaparvataśikhāṃ mugdhas tamībāndhavaḥ |*
> *yattāpicchatarucchadacchavi tamo lumpanti limpanti ca*
> *prāleyair iva pāradair iva jagatkośaṃ bhavatkīrtayaḥ ||16||*

The simple-minded Kinsman of the Night (=the Moon), carrying a stain black-colored [as if] bearing a mass of hair from the women of Kerala on its body (*aṅka*), foolishly rises to the peak of the Eastern Mountain—since your fame destroys the darkness—the bark-covering of the Tāmala tree— and smears [the night], the covering of the world,[82] as if with snow, as if

---

[79] The slipping off of bracelets is a common way to poetically describe despondency. See *Meghadūta* 2 ab:
> *tasminn adrau katicid abalāviprayuktaḥ sa kāmī*
> *nītvā māsān kanakavalayabhraṃśariktaprakoṣṭhaḥ |*
> On that peak the lover, having been separated from his wife for some time
> spent the months, the golden bracelets having slipped off of his fore-arm

[80] Skt. *cyutaramālava*, "the portion (*lava*) of Royal Splendor (*ramā=Śrī*) having been shaken off (*cyuta*). Śambhukavi cleverly embeds the world "Mālava" again within this compound.

[81] In terms of *anuprāsa*, the sounds l, r, and ḍ are considered by Alaṃkāraśāstrins to be interchangeable.

[82] Skt. *jagatkośa* seems to be a kenning for "the night." Perhaps this is a Kashmiri usage. See Jayantabhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī*
> *tejo 'nyad eva nakṣatraśaśāṅkaśakalādiṣu |*
> *uddhāṭitajagatkośam anyad eva raver mahaḥ ||*
and also Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīvita*
> *kiṃ saundaryamahārthasañcitajagatkośaikaratnaṃ vidheḥ*
> *kiṃ śṛṅgārasarassaroruhamidaṃ syātsaukumāryāvadhi |*

41

with mercury.[83]

Here again King Harṣa is placed within a fully conventionalized universe, the point being that the bright fame of the king outshines the moon. The moon, for all of its whiteness, still bears a black stain. Since fame in Sanskrit is conventionally white, the king is more famous than the moon is white. Again, the transregional referential sphere is also worth noting here. Śambhu mentions both Kerāla women and the *tamāla* tree, associated with the southern Mālaya mountains of the Malabar coast which further reinforces the "cosmopolitan" scope of the *Rājendrakarṇapūra*'s literary imagination. The imagery of this verse is rather expected, perhaps even cliché, however the power of Śambhukavi's piece is rather the length to which he takes this standardized comparison.

I take my final and perhaps the most telling example of patron-centered stylistics and Kashmir from the fourth verse of the *Rājendrakarṇapūra*. Śambhukavi writes:

> *vyāptavyomalate mṛgāṅkadhavale nirdhautadiṅmaṇḍale*
> *deva tvadyaśasi praśāntatamasi prauḍhe jagatpreyasi |*
> *kailāsanti mahībhṛtaḥ phaṇabhṛtaḥ śeṣanti pāthodayaḥ*
> *kṣīrodanti suradvipanti kariṇo haṃsanti puṃskokilāḥ ||4||*

> O king, in your fully matured fame, in which darkness is quelled, which is dear to the world which pervades the horizon,[84] pure like the deer-marked moon, and through which the entire world is purified, all mountains become Kailāsa, all snakes become Śeṣa, all lakes become the Ocean of Milk and all cuckoos become Royal Geese.[85]

The underlying logic of this verse perhaps most accurately sums up the ideology of Śambhukavi's *praśasti*-based vision of kingship, and indeed the literary imagination of Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. Through the power of Sanskritic expression, a reality-distortion field surrounds the king. All objects, no matter their mundane ontological status, are filtered through the radiance of the king; they then become part of the superlative and hyperbolic vision. Interestingly enough, such a process entails the burning off of all discriminating qualities of the king, his personality and activity takes place on a superhuman, almost mythical plane. The expression of ruling in such an imagination tries to free itself from particulars to take part in the ahistoric space of the Sanskrit cosmopolis.

The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* on the other hand eschews the use of such stylistics. While it often uses longer *kāvya* meters to drive home moral and political lessons, the tone never reaches the ecstatic hyperbole so often characteristic of Śambhukavi's description nor

---

> *kiṃ lāvaṇyapayonidherabhinavaṃ bimbaṃ sudhādīdhiter*
> *vaktuṃ kāntatatamānanaṃ tava mayā sāmyaṃ na niścīyate ||VJ 3.208||*

[83] Mercury is considered to the whitest substance.

[84] Literally "sky-vine" *vyomalatā*.

[85] Here I take the denominatives having the force of "become" following Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.1.11. I would like to thank Isaac Murchie for pointing out this usage.

does it exist in the flattened world of patron-centered poetry. An examination of Harṣa in Kalhaṇa's words will show just how far from the world of patron-centered *kāvya* expectations the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* has moved.

The story of Harṣa is one of the masterpieces of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* brilliantly showcasing the finest in Kalhaṇa's narrative skill. In itself it takes up the greater part of the seventh chapter of the text. I read the Harṣa-episode as the culmination of Kalhaṇa's own views on kingship. The tensions in political life which Kalhaṇa seeks to underline achieve their fullest form. While an in-depth analysis of the entirety of the Harṣa episode is impossible here, I will contrast Śambhu's hyperbolic description with Kalhaṇa's own introduction to the life of Harṣa. I show the ways in which the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* highlights the contradictions of rule and the double-edged sword that is greatness. Where Śambhu operates within the "reality distortion field" of political discourse, Kalhaṇa carves out a different space, and indeed a different idiom for the discussion of kings, fame, and politics. In introducing Harṣa, Kalhaṇa writes:

> *sarvotsāhodakakṣetraṃ sarvānullāsadūtikā |*
> *sarvavyavasthājananī sarvanītivyapohakṛt ||7.869||*
> *udriktaśāsanasphūrtir udriktājñākṣayakṣitiḥ |*
> *udriktatyāgasaṃpattir udriktaharaṇagrahā ||7.870||*
> *kāruṇyotsekasubhagā hiṃsotsekabhayaṃkarī |*
> *satkarmotsekalalitā pāpotsekakalaṅkitā ||7.871||*
> *spṛhaṇīyā ca varjyā ca vandyā nindyā ca sarvataḥ |*
> *niścodyā copahāsyā ca kāmyā śocyā ca dhīmatām ||7.872||*
> *āśāsyā cāpakīrtyā ca smāryā tyāgyā ca mānasāt |*
> *harṣarājāśrayā carcākathā vyāvarṇayiṣyate ||7.873||*

A field irrigated by every energy,
    the messenger of every disappointment—
Producing every firm judgment,
    emptied of every rule of policy—
Flashing forth with an excess of royal decree,
    a home for the excess disregard of command—
An excessive generosity of wealth,
    an excessive confiscation—
[Giving] an abundant happiness through compassion,
    causing an abundant fear through violence—
Abundant delight through good deeds,
    Abundant disgrace though sin—
Attractive and repulsive and praiseworthy and
    blameworthy on all sides—
To be accepted (*niścodya*) and derided and desired and lamented
    for the wise—
To be commended and decried and
    remembered and dismissed from the mind—
The contentious (*carcā-*) tale centered around King Harṣa
    is about to be told.

Kalhaṇa here strings together five verses into one long sentence known as a *kulaka*, the long syntactic unit gives the reader a sense of almost breathless anticipation which is finally relieved in the last quarter by the verb *vyāvarṇayiṣyate* (is about to be told). The first four and a half stanzas set up striking contrasts consisting entirely of nominal units set in apposition to the delayed subject. In verses 869-870 each quarter of the thirty-two syllable *śloka* meter is occupied by a single word eight-syllable word beginning with a common element, either *sarva-* ("all" or "every") or *udrikta-* ("abounding"). These appositional compounds stand in stark contrast with one another, setting up oppositional pairs to describe the paradox of Harṣa's rule, the repetition of the head words *sarva* and *udrikta* act as markers to drive home the closely and tragically intertwined aspects of Harṣa's character.

Such a strategy breaks one of the "rules" of *śāstra*-oriented *kāvya*. Alaṅkāraśāstrins argue that words should not be repeated in the same verse, giving the flaw known as *punarukti*, or using the same word in the same sense more than once in a verse. Here Kalhaṇa uses the repetition of words and phrases for a striking effect, eschewing verbal and lexical pyrotechnics for a powerful bluntness. Kalhaṇa's language shows something similar to the figure of anaphora in Western rhetorical theory.[86] Kalhaṇa's anaphora is used in a striking way, setting up opposed visions of Harṣa and his rule which, ungoverned by any verb or syntax, sit uncomfortable side by side as equally pertinent opposites, waiting to be reconciled. While this discussion of differences between figures of speech is technical, it shows the way in which Kalhaṇa strove to make a new poetic idiom, one that was markedly at odds with the conventions of *kāvya* presentation.

This is continued in verse 781 in which each half verse again presents an oppositional pair in a single octosyllabic word. The whole description reaches a feverish pitch in 782-783ab which presents a series of gerundives each linked with the simple connective particle *ca*. The force of the gerundive, stating what should be done with the story, gives a dizzying effect—you *should* be attracted to the tale, you *should* forget it, it is to be lauded, it is to be dismissed. The parallelism in the grammatical structure is at odds with vast number of contradictory verbal adjectives thrown breathlessly at the reader. The language here is forceful direct in a visceral way that the artful hyperboles of Śambhu cannot touch.

---

[86] A parallel to John Gaunt's famous speech in Shakespeare's Richard II perhaps suggests itself:

> **This** royal throne of kings, **this** sceptred isle,
> **This** earth of majesty, **this** seat of Mars,
> **This** other Eden, demi-paradise,
> **This** fortress built by Nature for herself
> Against infection and the hand of war,
> **This** happy breed of men, **this** little world,
> **This** precious stone set in the silver sea, […]
> **This** nurse, **this** teeming womb of royal kings […]
> **This** land of such dear souls, **this** dear dear land […]

In the story of Harṣa, the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* offers a new modality of talking about the king, one that revels in ambiguities and delves into the mutable nature of humans—especially the great and powerful. Such a new modality opens doors to the moral and historical imagination that animates a narrative of the past. While questions of Kalhaṇa's morality in the structuring of narrative will be the focus of the next chapter, I argue that a reaction to *praśasti* language and style allows for new narrative insights that in turn allow for the development of a new sort of historicity. To call the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* a *kāvya* requires an openness to the idea that Kalhaṇa deliberately avoids a certain idiom that tends to underlie the poetic worldview of poets such as Śambhu.

I turn to one final example in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s description of Harṣa where Kalhaṇa deliberately undermines patron-centered poetic tropes. Kalhaṇa ends his introductory description of Harṣa with the following verse:

> *nūnāṃ sa taijasair eva sasṛje paramāṇubhiḥ |*
> *kuto'nyathābhūt prasave duṣprekṣyo mahatām api ||7.874||*

> Surely be must have been created by particles
>   of fiery brilliance alone,
> How else would be have been so difficult to behold
>   in his splendor (*prasava*)
>   for even the great?

We see a surprising shift in the language of *praśasti* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. While Śambhu delights in taking *kāvya* tropes to the most exaggerated degree, Kalhaṇa infuses them with a new life, a new realism, by turning the excesses of *praśasti* vocabulary back on itself. In both Śambhu and Kalhaṇa, Harṣa is brilliant like the sun, but instead of pushing this brilliance toward an ever more ornate and stylized hyperbole, Kalhaṇa pointedly reminds the reader that one cannot stare directly into the sun, that a king's brilliance is also a dangerous thing, that the brighter one shines, the more dangerous he is. In the end, Kalhaṇa's poem uses *kāvya* norms against *kāvya* expectations; the shock in Kalhaṇa's portrayal is the veiled, almost gentle, reminder that the excessive language of poetry often hides a darkened double. In this Kalhaṇa is both deeply conversant with and highly wary of the excesses of poetic language which shows Kalhaṇa's deeply ambivalent relationship to kingship, reflected in a deeply ambivalent relationship toward poetic language.

3.4. History or Poetry? *Rasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*

The dichotomy of *kāvya* and *kathā* with which we began this story needs to be further nuanced by the introduction of another key term in Kalhaṇa's historiography: *rasa*. Simply put, *rasa* is the aesthetic pleasure that one derives from a work of art. To simplify greatly, Kashmiri literary theory holds that there are nine *rasa*-s, each corresponding to a basic human emotional state. So the *rasa* of wonder is paired with the emotion of astonishment, the *rasa* of the fearful is paired with fear, and so on. However, all *rasa*-s are inherently pleasurable; for that reason spectators enjoy seeing a horror film while they may not enjoy being afraid. The *rasa* most important for the study of Kalhaṇa

is *śānta rasa*, which grows out of the basic human emotion of world-weariness (*nirveda*).[87]

In most discussions of Kalhaṇa's poetic art mention of *śānta rasa* in the opening verses is enough to link the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* with the *kāvya* ideal. Such a correspondence facilitated by *rasa* elides the fraught relationsip between poetic practice and aesthetic theory. Further, equating *rasa* with *kāvya* oversimplifies the complex mechanics of *rasa* as actually used by poets.

      Within the study of Sanskrit literary culture, *rasa* has been used as a key to understanding elite culture. While much work has been done both tracing the development of the concept of *rasa* within intellectual history and its use for interpreting *kāvya*,[88] very little work has been done looking at the way in which poets themselves add to this conversation. This slight distinction is an important one. What matters here is how Kalhaṇa uses and adapts the idea of *rasa*, not how a prescriptive *rasa*-based philosophy can be imposed on the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

      To this end, I investigate *rasa* not as a lens through which to see the entirety of the composition but rather as a tool within Kalhaṇa's conceptual storehouse which can be manipulated to serve his particular historiographical interests. My reading of *rasa* in Kalhaṇa in many ways runs counter to the common reading of *rasa* in South Asian literature in general and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in particular. Athough *rasa* has tended to be read as corroborating evidence to put the *Rāgataraṅgiṇī* firmly within the theoretical purview of *kāvya*,[89] such a viewpoint is in many ways blind to the way in which Kalhaṇa manipulates the concept. While the preceding section shows that much more is going on in the form of the poem, the ideologies underlying that form too are manipulated to create a Kashmiri historiography. Before turning to the mechanics of *śānta rasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, it is necessary to first outline the broad contours of *rasa* as Kalhaṇa understood the term. I look specifically to the Kashmiri theorist Ānandavardhana who provided the systematized account which became the basis for most later understandings of the term.[90] In the third chapter of his *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana lays out a broad philosophy for works of literature as holistic aesthetic artifacts. He writes:

---

[87] *Śānta rasa* has a strange and complicated history within Sanskrit intellectual history. Apparently it was not originally included the first instantiation of *rasa* theory, but the Kashmiri literary theorists added it to the original eight. Raghavan, V., *The Number of Rasas* (Madras [Chennai]: Adyar Library and Research Center, 1967).

[88] The development of *rasa* as a category from the *Nāṭyaśāstra* to the present has been discussed by a number of scholars. In *The Number of Rasas,* Raghavan traced the development of *śānta rasa* in the Indic tradition and Masson and Patwardhan have investigated the idea of *śānta rasa* as understood by the Kashmiri Abhinavagupta in *Śāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics*.

[89] For proponents of this view, see, for example, Kölver (1971) pp. 8-9, Slaje (2008a) Slaje (2008b), and Kaul (2013). In each of these cases *rasa* is taken as a given, necessary, and exclusive marker of *kāvya*.

[90] For an account of the systematization, see Lawrence McCrea, *The Teleology of Poetics in Medieval Kashmir* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008).

Now for another means by which a whole work may be suggestive of *rasa*: the abandoning of a pattern traditionally imposed on a story if it fails in any way to harmonize with the *rasa*. […] A poet when writing must concentrate with all of his soul on the *rasa*. If he observes a pattern in the story that goes against that *rasa*, he should eliminate it and bring in some other story appropriate to the *rasa* by his invention. A poet has no need to carry out a mere chronicle of events. That is a task accomplished by history (*itihāsa*).[91]

This section in his magnum opus centers around the production of *rasa*, or poetic flavor, as the defining characteristic and ultimate goal of poetic experience. According to Ānanda, this comes from a careful fashioning of a work of art, modulating and controlling the events and episodes to invoke in the audience the intended aesthetic experience. Interestingly enough, in this passage Ānanda contrasts the work of the poet with that of the historian. It seems that for Ānanda, "history" (in Sanskrit, *itihāsa*) is merely the chronological arrangement of events with no attempt to shape it in accordance to a larger aesthetic, moral, or philosophical structure. *Itihāsa* is thus an unreflective genre unconcerned with larger artistic goals.

Seen in this light, Kalhaṇa's work then seems completely in line with *kāvya* expectations. A programmatic reading of Kalhaṇa's introduction, which of course does underline the importance of *rasa*, in terms of Ānanda's genre distinction between *kāvya* and *itihāsa* puts it squarely in the camp of *kāvya*. This however flattens out the innovation Kalhaṇa packs into his work. This is not however to say that *rasa* as a concept did not remain hugely important to the crafting of Kalhaṇa's history, since Kalhaṇa explicitly states that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* takes part in the aesthetic space determined by *rasa*. Rather I argue here that Kalhaṇa is actively creating his own operational field for *rasa* outside of the prescriptive sphere delineated by the theoreticians.

Yet Lawrence McCrea has perceptively noted a disconnect between the *Dhvanyāloka*'s *rasa* and *rasa* in the text of *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. He writes: "Kalhaṇa is noteworthy chiefly for his refusal—surely a knowing refusal—to adopt the narrative

---

[91] *idam aparaṃ prabandhasya rasābhivyañjakatve nibandhanam. itivṛttavaśatātāṃ kathañcid rasānanuguṇāṃ sthitiṃ tyaktvā punar utprekṣyāpy antarābhīṣṭarasocita-kathonnayo vidheyaḥ yathā kālidasaprabandheṣu.* […] *kavinā vāvyam upanibadhnatā sarvātmanā rasaparatantreṇa bhavitavyam. atretivṛtte yadi rasānanuguṇāṃ sthitiṃ paśyet tademāṃ bhaṅktvāpi svatantrayā rasānuguṇaṃ kathāntaram utpādayet. na hi kaver itivṛttamātranirvahaṇena kiñcit prayojanam, itihāsād eva tatsiddheḥ.*
Anandavardhana *Dhvanyaloka*, ed. P. N Pattabhirama Sastri (Varanasi: Caukhambha Samskrta Samsthana, 2009), 335-36. My translation is modified from that of Ingalls, Masson, and Patwardhan in Anandavardhana, *The Dhvanyaloka of Anandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), 435-36.

strategies suggested by the Kashmiri theorists."[92] In McCrea's argument, the disconnect between theory and text is absolute, and there is no bridging the divide between properly theorized *rasa* and Kalhaṇa's purported resorting to *śānta rasa*. This is simply because Ānandavardhana does not admit the type of usage of sources demanded by history. McCrea writes: "It is not an 'invented' narrative which Kalhaṇa can simply shape at will in accordance with the needs of some preferred *rasa*. Nor is it a retelling of a narrative already recorded elsewhere such that, according to Ānandavardhana's reasoning, elements in the story could be reshaped without regard to historical authenticity."[93] He goes on to argue that the reason for this is that the very nature of history precludes meddling with the flow of events, and therefore the proper placement of the various underlying necessities to produce the *rasa* experience cannot be satisfactorily created. For Lawrence McCrea, "…the principal means the literary theorists recommend for the management of *rasa* in historically inspired plots are foreclosed by the very nature of the literary project he has assigned himself."[94]

I agree that *rasa* is central to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, however I part ways with McCrea's analysis on a few key points. First is McCrea's contention that since Kalhaṇa deals with past historical events, the text of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* cannot have the requisite flexibility to accommodate the idea of *rasa*. Such an assumption is false given that Kalhaṇa is actively patterning and organizing history. While the raw subject matter may be historical, the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* seeks toward a way of representing the past and in that way Kalhaṇa can be seen as a creative agent. The second is McCrea's underlying assumption that *rasa* theory is taken as presented by aesthetic theorists rather than creatively constituted by the poet of the text itself. These two disagreements are central to my own understanding of *rasa* in the text. I hold that Kalhaṇa takes the idea of *śānta rasa* and makes it the *rasa* of history; the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* creates a scope for the idea of *śānta* in a new and broadened sense, taking Ānanda's insight and deepening it through his organizing of a historical sensibility.

So where does Kalhaṇa get his model? Once again, the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* can perhaps point us toward a valid interpretation. The *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*'s fifteenth century Kashmiri commentator Jonarāja glosses *kathā* with *Mahābhārata* etc.,[95] showing that Kalhaṇa's poetic imagination was linked to the project and worldview of the great epic among Kashmiri intellectuals. Stein has convincingly shown that Kalhaṇa was extremely well versed in the epic, listing a number of parallel passages as evidence.[96] To place the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in the context of the *Mahābhārata* is an interesting and understandable interpretive move on Jonarāja's part, and it speaks as much to its place in the later Kashmiri literary tradition. The *Mahābhārata* was central to Kalhaṇa's literary and historical imagination. Cox perceptively notes: "Set within the tiny world of the Valley, Kalhaṇa's centuries-long narrative is cast on a much more human scale than the Epic's,

---

[92] Lawrence McCrea, "*Śāntarasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*: History, Epic, and Moral Decay," *IESHR* 50, 2 (2013): 190.

[93] *Ibid,* 190.

[94] *Ibid,* 190.

[95] On this compound Jonarāja writes: *tāś ca tā yā bahavaḥ kathā mahābhāratādayas tatparikrameṇa niraṅkuśaṃ taṃ kalyāṇaṃ sa samānitavān.*

[96] See Stein's introduction to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 11, esp. n. 7.

and it resoundingly lacks the dark consolation of Kṛṣṇa's presence. This line of thinking in part allows for Kalhaṇa's own particular take on *śāntarasa*."[97]

As I have argued in the preceding section, Kalhaṇa's project has a more tangled genealogy than is normally admitted in the history versus poetry dichotomy. In light of those arguments, it seems that Kalhaṇa is operating in a different and far more interesting space, negotiating between various genres and expectations.

I agree with McCrea's conclusion that "Kalhaṇa's epic survey of Kashmiri kingship can be seen not simply as a departure from the literary norms of the *mahākāvya*, but as a critique of, or a judgment on, literature, kingship, and even the world in general."[98] However, the matter must be nuanced to a greater degree by seeing Kalhaṇa as being engaged in the active creation of not only new texts and genres but also new interpretations and uses of theoretical models. In this way *śānta rasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is a living concept, undergirded by Ānanda's theorization and the example of the *Mahābhārata*, but still moving in new and unexpected ways. In such a way it can be read as a critique, but a creative critique using old concepts to foster new ways of looking at the world.

3.5. Toward a Literary History of a Literary History

This chapter has shown the way in which Kalhaṇa created a new historical form and vocabulary through a deliberate use of and reaction to past literary genres and concepts. A close reading of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in conversation with other Kashmiri texts can help us understand Kalhaṇa's formal, stylistic, and philosophical choices. A more nuanced reading of Kalhaṇa within this complex literary ecology can provide a new perspective on a particular instantiation of history in South Asia. First and foremost, a more thorough contextualization can help think beyond the artifical and unhelpful binary of either history or poetry.

I have drawn out another type of poetic genealogy in which to place the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, one defined by a specific type of Kashmiri writing—what I have termed as the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* and a specific understanding of *śānta rasa*-based aesthetics. Both of these influences speak to another type of regionalism operating in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, one that is determined by literary history and philosophical developments. In the end, I argue that the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is a poem of Sanskrit history, played out against the distant background of cosmopolitan Sanskrit *kāvya* and given a new life through the filter of the stylistics of the Kashmiri *kathā* and the literary expectations of a *śānta rasa*-based aesthetics. While this picture may be complicated, I think it can give a more nuanced understanding of Kalhaṇa and his intellectual project. While a clear-cut interpretation or genre identification of Kalhaṇa's history in terms of either western or Sanskrit theoretical categories is impossible given the nature of the text, it is important to place the genesis of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in conversation with the twelfth-century Kashmiri intellectual world. These contextualizations delineate a specifically Kashmiri mode of expression, one which is perhaps comparable to Western genres in its mimetic and moral

---

[97] Cox, "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness," 157.

[98] McCrea, "*Śāntarasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*," 198.

imagination, but still rooted in specific ways of writing and thinking in the Sanskrit twelfth-century Kashmir.

Chapter 4: The Limits of Kalhaṇa's Historiography

4.1. Introduction: The Poetics of the Past and Present in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*

> A *kavi* might be expected to perceive some structure, some plotting by
> fate, in his story.[99]

The previous chapter located the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* within a particular Kashmiri space, regional in its outlook and shaped by a particularly Kashmiri ecology of texts. Having outlined the conversations that informed the creation of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and Kalhaṇa's reaction to and adaptation of earlier literary forms and concepts, I turn in this chapter to the actual construction of the text and its underlying historiographical and moral imagination. That is not to say that the received *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is not without its internal tensions, rather that these internal contradictions provide a dynamic force underlying the entirety of the text. This chapter looks to the disconnect between the poetics of the past and the representation of the present within the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* itself, and the way these tensions complicate Kalhaṇa's historiography. The mode of writing enabled by Kalhaṇa's reaction to classical *kāvya* modalities, his use of the translational sensibility of the Kashmiri *kathā*, and his appropriation of a *śānta rasa*-inspired outlook work well for organizing a coherent narrative of the past, yet can such a controlled and ordered worldview comprehend a messy and unfinished present?

Kalhaṇa sculpts the narrative of the text to conform to his implicit philosophy of history and the historical process. Like Gibbon's *Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, through most of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* Kalhaṇa takes the position of a chronicler removed from the events by time, describing greatness and its dissolution from the certainty of hindsight. Yet unlike Gibbon and his *Decline and Fall*, Kalhaṇa's remove does not last, the flow of history pushes relentlessly, inexorably to his own present. The stable and stabilizing historiography of the hindsight gives way to the messy and contingent events of the present, and the shift to the contemporary Kashmiri political arena leaves marked traces within the structure of the text itself.

I am not the first to notice a sort of disconnect between different portions of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. The most perceptive and useful schematic understanding of the internal differences within the text comes in Kumkum Roy's article "Making a Maṇḍala: Fuzzy Frontiers of Kalhaṇa's Kashmir." She notices incompatabilities among the different portions of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, which she terms the "strata" of its construction. She theorizes three layers in the text itself:

> In terms of the structure and content, the eight taraṅgas of the text can be
> grouped into three broad strata. The first includes the first three taraṅgas.
> These are relatively short, but deal with what is projected as an immense
> span of history from the inception of the world to a relatively more recent
> point in time, c. the 7th century AD. This is a time frame within which the
> literal truth is somewhat irrelevant: what seems to be central is the creation
> of a mythical past, a space in which an ideal socio-political order could be

---

[99] A. K. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature*, *Vol. VII, Part 2* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1972) 117.

projected […]. The second stratum includes taraṅgas four through six, and deals with the recent past. Here Kalhaṇa's account of socio-political relations becomes both more vivid and complicated. We encounter deviations from the norm that are recounted with obvious disapproval. These trends are far more commonplace in the last two taraṅgas, which constitute the third stratum, where Kalhaṇa grimly enumerates the sordid details of more or less contemporary events, far removed from the idyllic stereotypes of his normative world.[100]

While Roy's division is insightful, her intuition into the construction of the text deserves to be further investigated. I say intuition because her differentiation between strata two and three in her argument remains largely an untheorized matter of degree. She also makes Kalhaṇa into a moralist, in which an idealized static norm is held as a baseline against which the depredations of the Kaliyuga (Age of Kali) are compared. I will argue that there is indeed a moral imagination at work, but it is more complicated than a simple lament of norm and deviation.

Using Roy's idea of differentiated strata as a starting point, I concentrate the division between Roy's stages two and three,[101] which I think Roy is correct to have identified as being qualitatively different but wrong to have seen merely as a matter of degree. Rather, I think a very pertinent division between the "recent" history of Roy's second stratum and the "contemporary" history in the third stratum is built into the text itself. However, I would rather divide the second and third "strata" between the seventh *taraṅga* and the eighth. This separation of the first seven and the eighth chapter is not merely a matter of my own subjective reading of the text. Kalhaṇa himself clearly demarcated these two sections: he refers to his eight-chapter masterpiece as the seven mouths of the Godāvarī river flowing into the sea; following the numerical logic of that metaphor, the seven *taraṅga*-s of Kashmir's history empty into the ocean of the present.

Given that Kalhaṇa makes this division, the underlying tension between the controlled historiography of the past and the more difficult representation of the present deserves closer attention. I argue that Kalhaṇa's historiography in the first seven *taraṅga*-s meditates on the fickleness of both fate and the character of kings, which allows for a *nirveda*- and *śāntarasa*-based historiography. Such a preoccupation brings with it a particular historical outlook, which one might call Kalhaṇa's "normal" historiography.[102] However, in the eighth *taraṅga* the politics of the present denies such a clean historiographical model; the messiness, the unfinished contingency of the present

---

[100] Roy, 2010, "Making a Maṇḍala: The Fuzzy Frontiers of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*," in *The Power of Gender and the Gender of Power*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press) 344.

[101] Roy's understanding of the first stratum remains a valid way of understanding the locality, the deeply historic connections with *purāṇic* accounts, and the thickly evocative world in which the later *taraṅga*-s take place. Roy's argument that the first three *taraṅga*-s open a conceptual space—a known, idealized Kashmiri space.

[102] I take this idea and term from Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Without arguing for too strong of a parallel, it is perhaps helpful to think of the structure of the first seven *taraṅga*-s as the normal paradigm, which is interrupted, questioned and perhaps even incompatable with the contingencies of the eighth.

does not allow for such a cleanly theorized reading of the mutability of time and the mechanics of kingship.

In the first part of this chapter I delineate the normal historiography as depicted in Roy's second stratum (*taraṅga*-s 4-6, in which I also include *taraṅga* 7) as exemplary of the way in which Kalhaṇa shapes narratives of the past. As discussed in the previous chapter, Kalhaṇa's text relies upon a translational appropriation of the past using the *ślokakathā* genre, a *śāntarasa*-based aesthetics, and real documentary goal which is not entirely bound to a patron-centered literary economy. I think it is, however, worth trying to articulate Kalhaṇa's understated theory of history and its corollary philosophies of ethics and representation. This theory is particularly forcefully expressed in the middle section of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. I look in particular to the fourth chapter (Sanskrit *taraṅga* or "wave") and the telling of the rise and fall of the Kārkoṭa dynasty as exemplary of this literary, historical, and moral imagination.

In the second part of this chapter, I will look at the instability inherent in Kalhaṇa's normal historiography. The poetics of the present demands a different point of view; that is to say to shape a historical narrative, one must have some distance (the Sanskrit word used by Kalhaṇa is *taṭastha*, literally "standing on the [river]bank"). When Kalhaṇa writes his own present in the massive eighth *taraṅga*, the ability to shape a particular kind of narrative is slowly undermined, and his own carefully constructed historiography gives way in the face of an uncertain present. The juxtaposition of the first seven *taraṅga*-s and the eighth creates a palpable internal tension which will propel innovations in the later historical poems of Jonarāja and particularly Śrīvara.

I outline both the idealized vision of the world and literary representation existing behind the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in Kalhaṇa's normal historiography as well as its telling silences, inconsistencies, and instabilities. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* has a powerful vision organizing the past, but one that is constantly at odds with political and literary pressures of the present. The following sections outline a powerful and creative internal tension between the representational universe in the first seven *taraṅga*-s and Kalhaṇa's difficulty squaring this with the messy and provisional present. The tension between past and present, reflective history and the unfinished now, remains productive throughout the later trajectory of Kashmiri *Rājataraṅgiṇī*-s.

4.2: Kalhaṇa's "Normal" Historiography: Muktāpīḍa, Jayāpīḍa, and the Rise and Fall of the Kārkoṭa Dynasty

In this section, I begin with endings. In Kalhaṇa, endings are always also beginnings. Throughout the text he begins and ends a dynasty in the same verse, weaving the demise of one family seamlessly into the rise of another. As an example look at the way in which Kalhaṇa frames the Kārkoṭa dynasty (ca. 630[103]-855). He concludes the section on their predecessors, the Gonandas, with the following verse:

---

[103] The early dates of this dynasty are difficult to ascertain. Using Chinese sources, Stein shows that the first Kārkoṭa ruler, Durlabhavardhana (Chinese Tu-lo-pa) controlled the route from China to the Kabul valley between 627 and 649. See Stein's introduction to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 87.

atha vigalitā gonandorvībhujo 'bhijanāc chucer
atiśucini bhūḥ kārkoṭāheḥ kule vyadhita sthitam |
ciraparicitāt svargābhogādhvanaḥ patanaṃ śritā
tribhuvanaguroḥ śambhor maulāv ivāmaranimnagā || RT 3.530 ||

And so the earth, slipping away from the line of the radiant Gonanda kings
found repose in the still more radiant family of the Nāga Karkoṭa
like the immortal river [Gaṅgā] after falling from its curving path
in heaven—long familiar — [finds rest] in the crown of Śambhu,
teacher of the triple world.

The demise of those same Kārkoṭas is told in a strikingly similar manner:

rājñāṃ kārkoṭavaṃśyānāṃ kṣīṇaprāyam abhūt kulam |
vaṃśas tūtpalakulyānāṃ bhuvi vaipulyam āyayau || RT 4.713 ||

The kings of the lineage of the Karkoṭa dynasty
Was all but destroyed.
On the other hand,
The dynasty of Utpala
Grew and grew upon the earth.

The first of these verses closes the third *taraṅga* of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the second closes
the fourth. These verses give a firm sense of closure, their finality. In the first, the earth
slips away from the Gonanda kings; in the second, the Kārkoṭas are nowhere to be found.
Yet the absolute ending of one family's fortune is coupled in the very same verse with the
rise of another. When read together there is a brusque quality to Kalhaṇa's account, as if
there is no time for the past to be mourned or remembered; the moment one cycle ends,
another begins. For the first seven chapters of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Kalhaṇa's
historiographical paradigm operates by outlining this rise and fall of dynasties, and the
individual rises and falls of the kings within it. This process is constantly repeated
throughout the first seven chapters, reaching its mature form with the account of the
Kārkoṭas in the fourth *taraṅga*.

In order to see Kalhaṇa's ideal model of how to describe history and kingship in
action, this chapter explores the fourth *taraṅga* of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, especially the
Kārkoṭa kings Muktāpīḍa, known by his royal title Lalitāditya (r. ca. 700-736[104]), and his
grandson Jayāpīḍa (r. ca 751-882[105]). This chapter, sequentially middlemost in the
organizational scheme of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* has received some attention as the most
finely crafted portion of Kalhaṇa's great poem and also its striking characterizations of

---

[104] For an account of the dating of Muktāpīḍa/Lalitāditya, see Stein's introduction to the
Rājataraṅgiṇī, 130-131, esp. n. 126.
[105] The dates above are reckoned from Kalhaṇa's own dating, but Stein argues that
Jayāpīḍa's dates "in all probability fell closer to the end of the eighth century," see
Stein's introduction, 94.

the central figures.[106] Further, Kalhaṇa himself recursively uses the Kārkoṭa dynasty as a benchmark through constant references to the reigns of Lalitāditya and Jayāpīḍa throughout the later portions of the book. Whitney Cox has recognized in his discussion of King Harṣa that this king is often compared and contrasted with the legendary kings in the fourth *taraṅga*. Not only does the narrative follow the same general shape, but Harṣa himself retells the events of the life of Lalitāditya.[107] So what makes this *taraṅga* both microcosm and a touchstone for the rest of the work?

At the most macroscopic level, the two major kings of the fourth *taraṅga*, Lalitāditya and Jayāpīḍa, each rise to greatness after a series of adventures and at the height of their power fall victim to madness and consequently suffer a somewhat uncanny end. Like a wave, the structure emphasizes the rise and fall of the Kārkoṭa dynasty as it moves from the promise of greatness to dissolution. It is also worth noting that the main section of this central book of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is a sort of political sermon, spoken by the great Lalitāditya to his successors. A striking meditation of the ethics of rule, it remains even more poignant given its position in the text and the reader's knowledge of the events to come. The promise of the Kārkoṭa dynasty inevitably remains unfulfilled, the shining successors of the Gonandas become nothing more than a cautionary memory—unheeded—to the following Utpala dynasty.

The two major reigns of the fourth book show how Kalhaṇa constructs a narrative, full of tension and life but carefully controlled within his pessimistic historiography of transience. First we begin with Muktāpīḍa/Lalitāditya, the king who became a legend. The story of Lalitāditya is one of the best known in the entirety of the text. Marc Aurel Stein notes that "Kalhaṇa represents Lalitāditya as a great conqueror, whose reign was mostly passed in expeditions abroad. In the description of the latter we find a curious mixture of historical and legendary details."[108] Stein is correct in noting the strangeness of the narrative, yet this "curious mixture" needs a bit of unpacking, especially since Lalitāditya will become a central figure in the imaginary of the entire *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

Lalitāditya is the youngest of three brothers, and gains the throne after his middle brother resorts to witchcraft against the eldest, and the sorcerer himself is destroyed through the black arts. Already before his coronation the story of Lalitāditya is cloaked in magic and strangeness, and his rule is introduced by a verse that highlights his otherworldliness:

> *rājā śrīlalitādityaḥ sārvabhaumas tato 'bhūt |*
> *prādeśikeśvarasraṣṭur vidher buddher agocāraḥ || RT 4.126 ||*

> Then the illustrious Lalitāditya became king
> ruling the entire earth
> beyond the scope of the comprehension of Fate

---

[106] For instance, A. K. Warder's *History of Indian Kāvya Literature* takes fully half of his examples from this section of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.
[107] See Whitney Cox, "Literary Register and Historical Consciousnes." For Harṣa's retelling of the story of Lalitāditya, see vss. 7.1427-7.1451.
[108] Stein's introduction to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 88-89.

who creates lords
limited to a single country.

The career of Lalitāditya proves as remarkable as the first verse suggests. The ruler triumphantly marches out beyond the mountain-enclosed space of the valley and conquers the kings of North India, including the land of Kanyakubjā (Kannauj) and its famed king Yaśovarman. He travels northward over the high Himalayas and subjugates the lands of the Tibetans and Turuṣkas. Back within the Valley itself he and the elite members of his entourage endow many temples and monasteries and he founds a number of towns.

While back in Kashmir, he is visited by a messenger of the gods, who tells him of the merit he has earned in previous lives as well as the powers bestowed on him. One of these is the ability to make water appear at will, which serves him greatly when he marches north again and is lost with his army on the waterless Ocean of Sand in the far north. Finding his instigator and guide have betrayed him, Lalitāditya uses his magical lance to draw up a stream from the underworld, saving himself and his troops from death by thirst. Kalhaṇa writes:

> *yathopayogaṃ tenaiva sthāne sthāne pravartitāḥ |*
> *adyāpi kuntavāhinyaḥ pravahanty uttarāpathe ||RT 4.306||*
> *sahasraśaḥ sambhavanto 'py apare bhuvanādbhutāḥ |*
> *atiprasaṅgabhaṅgena tadvṛttāntā na darśitāḥ ||RT 4.307||*

> Even today streams from his spear flow forth in the northern regions
> Made to issue in various places by him, according to his need.
> Even though other tales of his exploits exist in the thousands,
> Wonders of the world,
> They are not brought to light here, since they would break up
> the flow of the narrative.

It is perhaps interesting to note that here Kalhaṇa's editing eye cuts short the miraculous praise of the king. Where other poets like Śambhukavi would dilate upon a king with hyperbolic language, Kalhaṇa again confounds expectation. As if to remind us that we are not in the realm of patron-centered poetry, Kalhaṇa almost toys with conventional representation of perfect, god-like kings. He suddenly shifts attention away from the exploits of the most famous of Kashmiri conquerors to Lalitāditya more troubling, darker side. With startling abruptness immediately following on his paean to Lalitāditya's miraculous power, Kalhaṇa writes:

> *yan niḥśabdajalā ghanāśmapuruṣe deśe 'tighorāravā*
> *yac cācchāḥ samaye payodamaline kāluṣyasaṃdūṣitāḥ |*
> *dṛśyante kulanimagnā api paraṃ digdeśakālāv imau*
> *tat satyaṃ mahatām api svasadṛśācārapravṛttipradau ||RT 4.308||*
> *kaler vāyaṃ prabhāvaḥ syān naranāthāsanasya vā |*
> *yat so 'pi bhīmakaluṣāḥ pravṛttīḥ samadarśayat ||RT 4.309||*

As great rivers (*kulanimnagā*)[109] with silent water,
In a place of dense rough stones
        Thunder terribly
And as they—crystal clear—at a time darkened by clouds
Are seen as completely befouled by filth
Truly, so too must the great
Conform their own conduct to these two—
        Place and Time.
Or was it the power of the Kali Age
Or of the throne of the lord of men
That he too displayed acts of terrible evil?

Again it must be stressed that this verse follows immediately upon the verse describing the miraculous river of the lance. In *alaṃkāraśāstric* parlance this might be a cause for *rasabhaṅga*, the breaking of a poetic mood, but, as I have suggested earlier, Kalhaṇa plays by his own rules. The sudden shift is a mimetic reminder of the mutability of great people. The narrative flow of Kalhaṇa's *śloka*-s is broken by the long *śārdūlavikrīḍita* meter, often used in royal *praśasti*-s[110] but here, the inherent greatness of the king, so often taken for granted in Sanskrit portrayals of royalty, is shown to be unstable. The reassertion of the metaphor of the river here is telling: just as rivers are subject to the strictures of space and time, so too does the River of Kings show that there is no immutable noble quality inherent in a king, it follows a tumultuous and changing path. This strange transition is followed by a strange story, in which the previously invincible world conqueror is shown in a very different light.

> *avarodhasakho rājā parihāsapure sthitaḥ |*
> *sa jātu madirākṣīvaḥ sacivān evam anvaśāt ||RT 4.310||*
> *kṛtaṃ pravarasenena yad etat pravaraṃ puram |*

---

[109] *Kulanimnaga* is a strange word for river; Monier-Williams translates this as "principle river" and cites this very verse. *Nimnaga* means literally "that which goes (-*ga*) down (*nimna*)," and the word *kula* which normally means "family" or "lineage". Kalhaṇa seems to pun on the great patron (? *kula*) rivers of an area, and the downward descent of a lineages.

[110] Throughout the Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, changes of topic are often marked by longer, more introspective gnomic verses. The use of meters has been studied by Kölver, but possible correlations between meter and subject matter has yet to be undertaken. The Kashmiri polymath Kṣemendra (eleventh c. Kashmir) in his idiosyncratic *Suvṛttatilaka* gives listings of appropriate topics for different meters. On the use of this meter, he writes: "The Śārdūlavikrīḍita is preferred in order to praise the heroism of kings and the like." (*śauryastave nṛpādīnāṃ śārdūlakrīḍitaṃ matam*, *Suvṛttatilaka* 3.22ab) and the majority of the examples adduced in this work for this meter deal with the valor of kings. It is also interesting to note that the previously mentioned Śambhukavi's fantastic *praśasti* on King Harṣa is almost completely written in the *Śardūla* meter. All of this is to suggest that in Kalhaṇa's sudden shift of emphasis there is the possibility of a slightly ironic use of Sanskrit meter to drive home the point.

tan nirdahatha manyadhve matpurasyeva cecchriyam ||RT 4.311||
ghorām alaṅghitājñasya śrutvety ājñāṃ mahīpateḥ |
gatvāśvaghāsakūṭāni te 'dahan vātulānake ||RT 4.312||
harmyāgrād vīkṣamāṇas tadvahnijvālojjvalānanaḥ |
ulkāmukha ivābhut sa harṣāṭṭahasitotkuṭaḥ ||RT 4.313||
dveṣādivaikṛtavataḥ pratibhāsite 'nyo
mithyaiva citram adhiko viśadātmano 'pi |
candrādi paśyati puro dviguṇaṃ prakṛtyā
tejomayaṃ timiradoṣahataṃ hi cakṣuḥ ||RT 4.314||
naivaṃ ced ekam api tatpuraṃ pravarabhūpateḥ |
asakhyapuranirmātā sa vivedādhikaṃ kutaḥ || RT 4.315||
kṣīṇakṣaivyo 'tha nirdhyāya nagaraploṣakilbiṣam |
uṣṇaniḥśvāsasahṛdā pasparśe'nuśayāgninā ||RT 4.316||
tat kurvate 'ntaḥsuṣirā gūḍhaṃ yenātanukṣayam |
dahyante jīrṇataravaḥ koṭarasthānalā iva ||RT 4.317||

Once the king with the women of his harem was present in Parihāsapura. Intoxicated on liquor, he gave his ministers the following order: "This city of Pravara, which was made by King Pravarasena—burn it down if you think that it rivals the beauty of my city."

As soon as they heard that terrible order of the king who could not be disobeyed, they went to Vātulānaka and set fire to haystacks that were to be used as fodder for horses. Watching from the penthouse, his face was lit by the flames of its burning. It was as if his face was a meteor, upraised laughing with howls of joy (*harṣa*). What a wonder! To even a man pure by nature, when morbidly afflicted by things like envy, another appears, completely falsely, to be greater [than he really is]. He sees before him things like the moon as double, since his eye, naturally made of light (*tejas*), is struck down by cataracts. If it were not so, why would he, the founder of innumerable towns, have thought that just one town of king Pravara[sena] was too much?

And then, when his drunkenness had passed, reflecting on the sin of burning the town, he was overcome with the fire of regret, accompanied by hot sighs. Those, whose insides are dry do deeds by which secretly their bodies are totally consumed. They are burned like old trees, with a fire in their inner core.

Immediately afterward, the king feels great remorse, and the ministers tell the king that they had actually not burned the city, rather they had burned hay-ricks in the nearby countryside. The king is greatly relieved.[111]

---

[111] This story deserves much closer analysis. I would like to thank Ronald Inden for his insightful comments on this episode, he points out certain elements of comedy. For instance there seems to be a play on *parihāsa* "laughter" and the name of Pravarasena's city, Parihāsapura, also the fact that the king whose command was not to be obeyed was disobeyed seems strange. These elements demand further analysis, however, I feel that

The strange life of Lalitāditya ends in one of the most fascinating and beautiful scenes in the entirety of the text. He gives his final instructions on the art of rule and disappears into the far North, into the unknown and unknowable wilderness, reserved for the truly extrordinary. Kalhaṇa writes:

tuṣāravarṣair bahulais tam akāṇḍanipātibhiḥ |
āryāṇakābhidhe deśe vipannaṃ kecit ūcire ||RT 4.367||
rājaprasthāṃ pratiṣṭhāṃ sa rakṣituṃ cirasaṃcitām |
saṃkaṭe kvāpi dahanaṃ prāvikṣad iti kecana ||RT 4.368||
keṣāṃ cit tu mate bhūbhṛd davīyasy uttarāpathe |
so 'martyasulabhāṃ bhūmiṃ praviṣṭaḥ kaṭakānvitaḥ ||RT 4.369||
atyadbhutāni kṛtyāni śrutāny asya yathā kila |
vipattir api bhūbhartus tathaivātyadbhutā śrutā ||RT 4.370||
yāto 'staṃ dyumaṇiḥ payodhisalilaṃ kaiścit praviṣṭo 'paraiḥ
saṃprāpto dahanaṃ gataḥ kila parair lokāntaraṃ kīrtyate |
jāyante mahatām aho nirupamaprastānahevākināṃ
niḥsāmānyamahattvayogapiśunā vārtā vipattāv api ||RT 4.371||

Some said that he was lost in a land called Āryāṇaka in a snowstorm that fell unexpectedly. Some said that he entered the flames in some dire situation in order to preserve his position as foremost of kings which he had held for such a long time. According to the opinion of others, in the farthest North, the king along with his army entered that realm only accessible to the immortals. As his incredible deeds are commonly heard, so too the death of the king too is heard to be marvelous (*atyadbhuta*).

> When the sun goes down, some proclaim
> > it has entered into the ocean;
> Others — it has become one with fire
> Still others —
> > it has gone to another world.
> What a marvel!
> Stories about the mighty,
> > engrossed in their unparalleled position,
> > are maliciously insistent upon
> > their extraordinary greatness —
> Even in death.

The strange life of Lalitāditya casts a long shadow over the course of the poem. Kashmir's greatest king is also a great enigma; true greatness is unknowable, a matter for speculation.

After brief accounts of Lalitāditya's immediate successors (these three rulers are described in less than thirty verses) Kalhaṇa turns to the other focal point of the fourth *taraṅga*, the life of the brilliant and disturbed Jayāpīḍa. According to Stein,

---

even if there is a joking aspect behind this telling, it is very much dark humor given the way that Kalhaṇa ends the episode.

It is impossible in the absence of other records to ascertain the exact elements of historic truth underlying Kalhaṇa's romantic story. But the general tenor of the latter seems to indicate that Jayāpīḍa had, during the early part of his reign, while engaged in some foreign expedition, temporarily lost his throne to a usurper. The king's wanderings during his exile seem to have taken him to Bengal, and to have subsequently been embellished by popular imagination."[112]

The story of Jayāpīḍa surely contains elements of the fantastic, his early career seems to read like an episode from the romances of Daṇḍin or Bāṇa—or even more to the point like the great authors of the Kashmiri-style narrative poem Abhinanda or Somadeva.[113] The fairytale-like atmosphere of his peripatetic adventures in the Gangetic plain presages his revitalizing role of Sanskritic knowledge of North India in the Valley.

In his article "From Conqueror to Connoisseur: Kalhaṇa's Account of Jayāpīḍa and the Fashioning of Kashmir as a Kingdom of Learning," Yigal Bronner has argued that the fantastic nature of Jayāpīḍa's storied youth serves as a literary encoding of Jayāpīḍa's historical rise as a great patron of letters in Kashmir. Bronner argues persuasively that Kalhaṇa's Jayāpīḍa's rise shows a new imagination of Kashmir as the center of the literary and cultural world.[114] It is striking how emerging from a romantic tale of disguise and intrigue, Jayāpīḍa returns triumphant to Kashmir to recreate Kanauj, that great center of learning on the plains which he sacked on his return in the Himalayan valley. Bronner is right to characterize this striking episode as a sort of turning point in the narrative, in which Kashmir became the actual center of Sanskrit literary culture. However, I think Bronner only tells half the story; he mentions Jayāpīḍa's madness and downfall,[115] but does not give it the weight it is entitled to in Kalhaṇa's literary imagination.

To briefly sketch the trajectory of Jayāpīḍa, immediately his rule is defined in relation to his grandfather:

pitāmahasamo bhūyād ity amātyavacaḥ smaran |
jigīṣuḥ saṃbhṛtabalo digjayāya sa niryayau ||RT 4.403||

---

[112] Stein, introduction to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 94.

[113] For a further explanation of this style, see chapter six of this dissertation. Cox's discussion of this genre as a register is also informative, see Cox, "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness." I have also laid out a brief exploration of Kashmiri *śloka*-based literature with special reference to the work of Abhinanda, see Obrock, "Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra*."

[114] See Bronner, "From Conqueror to Connoisseur: Kalhaṇa's Account of Jayāpīḍa and the Fashioning of Kashmir as a Kingdom of Learning." *IESHR* 50, 2 (2013).

[115] See Bronner *ibid*. especially pp. 173-4 and note 39. Bronner characterizes the sea change seen in Jayāpīḍa's reign as one in which the martial adventurism and power exemplified by Lalitāditya is transformed into the "soft power" of a cultural center.

Remembering the words of his ministers: "May you be like unto your grandfather," he gathered his forces and went out, desiring conquest of the quarters.

Jayāpīḍa does his best to live up to this tall order, setting out with his armies to repeat the conquest of his grandfather. However, trouble starts not far from home, when his brother-in-law Jajja usurps the throne. At Prayāga (Allahabad), the rest of Jayāpīḍa's troops desert him and he travels to the east to make his way in the world. A picaresque tale ensues, he kills a lion, gains a wife and a kingdom. He returns to Kashmir to defeat, almost through dumb luck, the usurper Jajja and is restored to his throne.

As Bronner highlights in his essay, Jayāpīḍa after his return also works hard to make Kashmir a center of learning. He lures scholars from all over the Sanskrit-speaking world offering huge salaries and royal prestige. The roster of the intellectuals in his employ reads like a who's who of ninth-century South Asian letters: the Buddhist logician Dharmottara, the rhetorician Udbhaṭa, and satirical poet Dāmodara are among the most famous. His sack of Kannauj resonates in Kashmir as he aggressively fosters his own court as the new center of Sanskritic culture. What Yaśovarman's court was to eighth century India with such luminaries as Bhavabhūti and Vākpatirāja, so was Kashmir to become under the patronage of Jayāpīḍa.[116]

Yet Jayāpīḍa's glorious reign is short lived, he soon becomes consumed by an inner madness which transforms him from the vaunted restorer of the Kārkoṭa dynasty's glory into a dangerous figure. Even the poets previously patronized by Jayāpīḍa turn against him, writing clever verses which, although seeming to praise the king, in reality heap abuses on him. Kalhaṇa writes:

> *yat satāṃ praśamādhāyi pāpasyopadideśa tat |*
> *jayāpīḍasya pāṇḍityaṃ prajāpīḍanaśauṇḍatām ||RT 4.625||*

> Learning (*pāṇḍitya*), which for the good bestows peace of mind, for Jayāpīḍa, wicked [as he had become] taught only the drunk addiction to the oppression of his subjects.

Learning, the essential characteristic of Jayāpīḍa's reign so well documented both in Kalhaṇa's telling and Bronner's exegesis now somehow becomes the seed of his undoing, just as the *wanderlust* which defined Lalitāditya drove him to unknowable end.

---

[116] The subplot of a deeply seated rivalry/fascination with Kannauj underlies much of the fourth *taraṅga*. Jayāpīḍa's grandfather Lalitāditya too defeats the famed Yaśovarman and sacks the city. This relationship is not only confined to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. It is interesting to note that verses 880-928 of the *Kuṭṭanīmata*, written by Jayāpīḍa's court poet Dāmodara contain a detailed account of an enactment of the *Ratnāvalī* of King Harṣavarman. While these literary connections deserve further research, it seems that a kind of conscientious adaptation of Kannauj culture and literature was undertaken at the same time as violent military action.

Note how Kalhaṇa frames the instability of the king: Jayāpīḍa, known for his wisdom and learning, is abandoned by his coterie scholars. In the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the Sanskrit language itself becomes a site of rebellion and protest. Kalhaṇa writes:

viparyastacaritrasya tasya krūrasya bhūpateḥ |
evaṃ stutiviparyāsaḥ kāvyeṣv api budhaiḥ kṛtaḥ ||RT 4.634||
nitāntaṃ kṛtakṛtyasya guṇavṛddhividhāyinaḥ |
śrījayāpīḍadevasya pāṇineś ca kim antaram? ||RT 4.635||
bhāṣyavyākhyākṣaṇe ślokair vaicakṣaṇyahṛtaiḥ kṛtaḥ |
so'yam tasya viparyāso budhair evaṃ pravartitaḥ ||RT 4.636||
kṛtaviproprasargasya bhūtaniṣṭhāvidhāyinaḥ |
śrījayāpīḍadevasya pāṇineś ca kim antaram ||RT 4.637||

For the king, his behavior being reversed to cruelty, so did the wise make back-handed praise in poetry:
      "What is the difference between the illustrious Jayāpīḍa and Pāṇini? [Jayāpīḍa] has accomplished all tasks and caused the increase of virtue [while Pāṇini] treated at length the *kṛt-* affixes and has set down rules for *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*."
      Such an opposition to him was thus set down in a moment of explication on the *Mahābhāṣya*, made through a verse that was cleverly appropriated:
      "What is the difference between the illustrious Jayāpīḍa and Pāṇini? [Jayāpīḍa] has subjugated himself to Brahmins and brought about the perfection of beings [while Pāṇini] has treated the verbal prefixes *vi* and *pra* and has prescribed the rules for the *niṣṭhā* terminations of the past tense."

The verse provides a Sanskrit grammatical pun simultaneously in praise of the great grammarian Pāṇiṇi and Jayāpīḍa. Here the king's scholarship flattered with pointed allusions to finer points of grammatical philosophy (*kṛt*-affixes, *niṣṭhā* terminations, etc.) while setting up an implicit comparison between the great grammarian Pāṇini and Jayāpīḍa. The second *śleṣa* verse also has pointed reference to Jayāpīḍa's reintroduction of the Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* into the valley.[117] However, in reality, these verses do not have *double* meaning, rather they have *triple* meaning. The final meaning of these two verses, hidden in the combination of phonemes is the following (highlighted in boldface type):

      "What is the difference between the illustrious Jayāpīḍa and Pāṇini? **[Jayāpīḍa] destroyed all works and slew all virtues** [while Pāṇini] treated at length the *kṛt-* affixes and has set down rules for *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*."
And

"What is the difference between the illustrious Jayāpīḍa and Pāṇini? **[Jayāpīḍa] has caused disaster for the Brahmins and has destroyed all beings** [while Pāṇini] has treated the verbal prefixes *vi* and *pra* and has prescribed the rules for the *niṣṭhā* terminations of the past tense."

Whereas the meaning suggested in the first *śleṣa* interpretation is: "What is the difference between the great Pāṇini and Jayāpīḍa? Not much, they are both unparalleled in their own respective fields (i.e. grammar and kingship)." The suggested sense in the second is: "The difference is indeed very great." The great scholars of Sanskrit turn the very language he previously supported into a site of dissent. Indeed the Sanskrit language itself turns against him, the praises automatically encoding censure.

In Kalhaṇa's telling, Jayāpīḍa robs, tortures, and murders Brahmins, and thousands fast on account of the injustices heaped upon them. Jayāpīḍa finally meets his end after a shouting match with a disenfranchized yet fearless Brahmin. At the power of the Brahmin's curse, a piece of the canopy under which Jayāpīḍa sits breaks free and strikes him on the leg. His injury becomes infected and, in one of the most gruesome verses in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the infected flesh must be hacked away with a saw while worms pour out of the gaping wound. Jayāpīḍa dies ignominiously shortly thereafter.

This gruesome death (it is told with a sort of *jugupsā* relish in the Sanskrit) is a far cry from the benediction that began his reign. The cosmopolitan kingdom of letters fostered under his patronage revolts against him, perverting the very language of scholarship and praise into an invective against its patron. Jayāpīḍa and Lalitāditya follow two different paths, but the trajectories remain somehow similar. This similarity provides the basis for I understand the moral underpinnings of Kalhaṇa's historiography.

When describing these great rulers (and others of similar brilliance, think Harṣa in the seventh *taraṅga*), Kalhaṇa always shows a seed of their downfall. While in the case of Lalitāditya, this urge to incinerate an entire city is deflected, it is still lives in the mind of the king and the memory of the text. This is the key to understanding Kalhaṇa's history: even brilliant kings like Lalitāditya and especially Jayāpīḍa have no inherent stability of character. Since their characters are mutable nothing is really lasting in this world. Like a river, change is its constancy and like a wave it rises only to fall back upon itself. This idea is the key to understanding Kalhaṇa's treatment of the past. For Kalhaṇa, who cultivates the perspective of a disinterested spectator, the mutable nature (Sanskrit, *nisarga*) of kings is foregrounded. Kalhaṇa lays out this idea explicitly at the end of the eighth *taraṅga*:

> *ambho 'pi pravahatsvabhāvam aśanair āsyānam aśmāyate*
> *grāvāmbhaḥ sravati dravatvam uditodrekeṣu cāveyuṣaḥ |*
> *kālasyāskhalitaprabhāvarabhasaṃ bhāti prabhutve 'dbhute*
> *kasyāmutra vidhātṛśaktighaṭite mārge nisargaḥ sthiraḥ ||*

> Even the water, which is liquid by nature, freezes and turns in time (?) hard as stone, [while] the stone may dissolve into water. Under that wonderful dominion of Time, which has witnessed, even in beings of exceptional greatness, the rapid change of unlimited might, whose nature (*nisarga*) can remain unchanged on the road laid out by the power of

fate?[118]

This instability is what ties together the *śāntarasa*-based poetics developed under Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta with the poetics of the past. With the combination of narrative exposition and world-weary asides, Kalhaṇa creates a historiography based on a certain reading and organizing of the past. This essential characteristic of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* continues to inform the later works of Jonarāja and especially Śrīvara. The difficulty is how to adapt this worldview to a present-centered history.

4.3. The Poetics of the Present: The Eighth *Taraṅga* and the Ocean of the Present

> Now, you seem to me to be very rich and to be the monarch of many
> people, but I couldn't say anything about this question you keep asking me
> until I find out that you have ended your life well […] You have to see
> how everything turns out, for god gives a glimpse of happiness to many
> people, and then tears him up by the very roots.
> -Croesus to Solon, Herodotus *Histories*[119]

In Herodotus's famous account of Solon's conversation with the defeated Lydian king Croesus, Solon repeatedly questions his erstwhile rival. Repeatedly asking who is the happiest man on earth, Solon expects Croesus to give that honor to himself. The wise Croesus, refusing to give the other ruler the satisfaction of his expected answer, replies that no man can be called happy or unhappy until his entire story is known. Here, the question of writing history is tied intimately with the total story; no final moral judgment can be given about the path of another's life until it is totally and completely finished. Such an observation has deep resonances with the problem of writing history as it approaches the present, especially in a text that in some way hopes to include it. How indeed can one end a story that brings all of history up to the present moment? In this section I will argue that Kalhaṇa recognized the eighth *taraṅga* as somehow different. Further, the tension between Kalhaṇa's normal historiography in the first seven *taraṅga*-s and the account of the present creates a creative tension that becomes instrumental in the creation of new Sanskrit historicity under the reign of Zayn a-'Ābidin.

To return to the marked difference between the types of writing in the "historical" and "contemporary" sections of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Roy writes that "Kalhaṇa grimly enumerates the sordid details of more or less contemporary events far removed from the idyllic stereotypes of his normative world."[120] Such a statement is perceptive given that up to this point Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* shows that the past being past is able to be shaped and molded into a convincing narrative with a narrative arc and moral lesson. For Kalhaṇa, the problem arises with the present, since its forces are still latent or ongoing it cannot be catalogued into that same scheme of rise and fall that dominates the rest of the

---

[118] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 8.3406 trans. Stein, 267-8. The annotations including the "(?)" are from Stein's original translation.
[119] Herodotus, *The Histories*, ed. Walter Blanco and Jennifer Tolbert Roberts (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991), 13-14.
[120] Roy, "Making a *Maṇḍala*," 344.

text. The problem of the present becomes incredibly pressing for Kalhaṇa and his intellectual production. I argue that Kalhaṇa's eighth *taraṅga* is an attempt to diffuse this seeming incompatibility of a *śāntarasa* structured historical narrative with an uncertain, and in some ways unshapeably complex present.

While much attention has been given to Kalhaṇa's fashioning of the ancient history of Kashmir, much less scholarship has been concentrated on the part of the text dealing with nearly contemporaneous times. The eighth *taraṅga* of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in Stein's edition contains 3449 verses—almost half the entire work—more by far than any other book in the text. The eighth *taraṅga* deals with less than fifty years of history from the accession of Uccala in 1101 to the composition of the work in 1149/50, yet this portion of the work occupied Kalhaṇa to a high degree. Stein in his synopsis of the book is unhappy with its "diffuseness" which to his mind is neither important nor interesting enough to hold the interest of the modern reader. He writes that "…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."[121] Stein's attitude here is noteworthy, since it contains an implicit judgment on the historical or scholarly value of reading this part of the text.

Stein's judgment of the text strikes a chord, especially given the complex textual history of the eighth *taraṅga*. As Eugene Hultzsch shown in an important series of articles appearing after the initial publication of Stein's edition, the text of the eighth *taraṅga* itself is not stable. Certain recensions contain many different readings—one manuscript, called M by Hultzsch, contains fully 161 additional verses. Hultzsch argues, I think correctly, that this addition was penned by Kalhaṇa and not some later redactor.[122] The much larger question of what does it mean that two different versions of the eighth *taraṅga* circulated is beyond the scope of the present discussion, but I think it adds credence to the idea that dealing with the present remained a difficulty for Kalhaṇa, and the final form of the text remained unfixed.

The poetics of the past, which has so occupied modern scholarship, is insufficient to understand Kalhaṇa's project as a whole, which apart from shaping a narrative of the past, is actively about the politics of the present. I use the word actively advisedly since the text itself does not seem to have a fixed, stable relationship to power and the present. There is an ambivalence when talking of the current reign, an ambivalence deeply rooted in both Kalhaṇa's poetics as well as his inability to structure a cohesive moral philosophy to underlie the entirety of the text. This tension between an ordered historical imagination and the messy contingencies of the present so deeply embedded in the eighth *taraṅga* of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* continues through the works of Jonarāja and only finds its resolution in Śrīvara's formalistic reimagination of the genre in his biographical history of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*.

Whitney Cox in his important article on the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* focuses his attention on the character of Harṣa, the brilliant, neurotic, and violent king of Kashmir whose rise and fall fills most of the seventh *taraṅga* of the text. Cox is correct in picking this episode as central to the text and the text's imagination of itself. The story of Harṣa follows perfectly, beautifully, and irrevocably the formal and moral expectations of Kalhaṇa's

---

[121] Stein's introduction, 101.

[122] See Hultzsch (1915) "Kritische Bemerkungen zur *Rājataraṅgiṇī*," esp. 138-9.

śāntarasa-inspired historical consciousness. I also agree that the story of Harṣa is the centerpiece—both narratively and spatially—of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as a whole. I refer the reader to Cox's piece for a thoughtful and persuasive reading of this episode, here I only wish to stress that the story of Harṣa, so artfully crafted, marks a certain sort of end point in the narrative itself; the death of Harṣa and the end of the first Lohara Dynasty and the accession of Uccala and the beginning of the second Lohara Dynasty marks a move from the "historical" world of the first seven books to the "political" world of the eighth. So how can we begin to outline the interesting tensions within the eighth *taraṅga* of Kalhaṇa's massive work? Kalhaṇa himself at the end of the massive book states:

> *godāvarīsarid ivottumulais taraṅgair*
> *vaktraiḥ sphuṭaṃ sapadi saptabhir āpatantī* |
> *śrīkāntirājavipulābhijanābdhimadhyaṃ*
> *viśrantaye viśati rājataraṅgiṇīyam* ||*RT* 8.3449||

> Like the river Godāvarī, certainly falling into the sea at one time (*sapadi*) through its seven mouths, its waves crashing, this river of kings enters in the midst of ocean of the noble family (*vipulābhijana*) of the Illustrious Kāntirāja.

This verse suggests a way of reading the text of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and the contradictions therein. Kumkum Roy has read the verse to show that "Kalhaṇa compares his own enterprise with the Godavari, which enters the sea with its seven mouths."[123] However just from the parallelism of numbers, it seems that the first seven *taraṅga*-s of the tale of kings enters the ocean which is the eighth. It seems that for Kalhaṇa, the present is the ocean to which the past flows and is eventually merged. This verse indicates that Kalhaṇa sees the eighth *taraṅga* as actually being unlike the other seven. The other seven are merely rivers, the eighth is an ocean. What can this metaphor actually tell us about how to read the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*?

Following this logic, the eighth is the ultimate goal, something to which the other seven lead; it also is made of yet greater than the other seven. This verse also contains the indication of an actual praise of a king, Jayasiṃha (in the family of Kāntirāja), something that is entirely missing from the rest of the text. While Kalhaṇa is no Śambhukavi or Bilhaṇa, we are moving out of the normal *śānta rasa*-based historiography and into something more difficult to pin down. While this is no paean to Kalhaṇa's contemporary king Jayasiṃha (r. 1129-1150), there is certainly some flavor of the court-flatterer about Kalhaṇa at some points in the text. For instance, he writes:

> *iyadṛṣṭam ananyatra prajāpuṇyair mahībhujaḥ* |
> *paripākamanojñatvaṃ stheyāḥ kalpāgatāḥ samāḥ* || RT 8.3405 ||

> "May the matured wisdom of this king [which has been produced] by the subjects' merits and which has not been seen to such an extent in any other [ruler], last for years exceeding this Kalpa!" (Trans. Stein)

---

[123] Roy, "Making a Maṇḍala, 354.

While this verse with its benedictive quality does not compare to the artful hyperbole and flattened *praśasti* register of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* or the *Rājendrakarṇapūra*, it does indicate that Kalhaṇa had to be more careful and circumspect around contemporary power, and could not put the present king at the mercy of the same historiographical machinations shown in his normal historiography. A further verse preserved in Ratnakaṇṭha's unpublished seventeenth-century poetry anthology entitled the *Sārasamuccaya* indicates that Kalhaṇa authored some sort of encomium of King Jayasiṃha called the *Jayasiṃhābhyudaya* ("The Elevation of Jayasiṃha").[124] Although it is impossible to extrapolate a specific relationship between Kalhaṇa and Jayasiṃha (or any other ruler) from the testimony of these verses alone, it could point to a more complex role for Kalhaṇa in Kashmiri court life. As Kalhaṇa moves toward contemporary politics, Kalhaṇa no longer stands outside history and so the structured *śānta rasa* historiography begins to unravel, almost mimetically signaled by the breakdown in the authorial certainty of the text itself. Kalhaṇa begins to put more and more emphasis on the complex world in which the king is embedded as the cause of turmoil and trouble rather than on the character of the king or the nature of kingship. Kalhaṇa writes:

> *rājā bhavan paraḥ ko 'stu svavicāradṛḍhakriyaḥ |*
> *eṣo'pi śiśuvad bhūbhṛd yatra dhūrtaiḥ pravartyate ||8.2032||*
> *śaiśave bāliśaghrāyaiḥ saṃstutair jāḍyam arpitam |*
> *prauḍhāv api na vā yāyād rājñaḥ kārṣṇyam maṇer iva ||8.2033||*
> *bhṛtyāntarāparijñānamātreṇa jagatībhujām |*
> *nirāgaso vajrapātaḥ kaṣṭaṃ rāṣṭrasya jāyate ||8.2034||*

Another man, becoming a king, must have actions set firmly according to his own counsel where that very same king is impelled to act by scoundrels like some child. Or is it rather that for a king, the stupidity acquired in childhood through the praise accrued from infantile [flatterers] never leaves even in adulthood, as a flaw never leaves a jewel. Alas! A

---

[124] As quoted in Durgāprasāda and Peterson's edition of Vallabhadeva's *Subhāṣitāvali*, (p. 18), this verse praises a certain ruler:

Bhūbhṛtpadaṃ parvataśeṣam āsīt
Tasthau vidhāv eva ca rājaśabdaḥ |
Na vāhinīnāthakathā samudrād
Anyatra tasmin nṛpatau babhūva ||

The word "Earth-bearer" (*bhūbhṛt*) was saved for the mountains,
And the word "Rājā" stood only for the moon,
There was no-one to call "River-lord" (*vāhinīnātha*) other than the ocean
When he was the king.

This verse relies on double meanings inherent in certain Sanskrit words for "king", thus *bhūbhṛt* means mountain and king, *rājā* moon and king, *vāhinīnātha* means ocean and commander-in-chief (since *vāhinī* can mean both river and army).

lightning strike hits the sinless kingdom of kings merely through his inability to correctly judge amongst his servants.

In the eighth *taraṅga*, the question of judgment becomes more and more important. Now, instead of the inexorable push of history toward decay, ruin, and disappointment, the source of *śānta* comes from the inability to see the entire picture. The position of the *taṭastha* spectator becomes less tenable as one speaks of contemporary history. While Kalhaṇa does shift blame away from kings and toward their unworthy advisors, he also highlights that the hindsight and distance needed to create such a narrative is gone in the eighth *taraṅga*. Kalhaṇa writes of this difficulty of the historian's position in the following verses.

> *gaṇanā kathā vā bālabāliśādau vidhīyate |*
> *na cittavṛtter aikagryaṃ mahatām api sarvadā |8.2304||*
> *śrotṝṇāṃ dyūtapāñcālīkeśakṛṣyādi śṛṇvatām |*
> *pāṇḍavebho 'dhikaḥ krodho dhārtarāṣṭreṣu ||8.2305||*
> *kurūṇāṃ kṣatajāpāne bhagnoror mūrdhatāḍane |*
> *śrute pāṇḍavavidveṣas teṣām eva ca dṛśyate ||8.2306||*
> *parāvarajñaḥ kāryāṇāṃ na kaścin madhyamaṃ vinā |*
> *taṭasthe 'nubhavābhedas tatra tatra kathaṃ bhavet ||8.2307||*

> What reckoning or story should be made in regard to children, idiots, and the like? The great too never have their thoughts singly focused. For those hearing of the gambling match and the dragging of the Pañcāla Princess [Draupadī] by the hair, their anger is greater toward the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra than toward the Pāṇḍavas. [However,] when they hear of the drinking of the blood of the Kurus [and] the crushing of the head of the broken-thighed [Duryodhana], one sees a hatred on their part toward the Pāṇḍavas. No one can truly know the cause and effect of events (*kārya*) except for one [present] in their midst. How could there not be the a difference of feeling (*anubhava*) from time to time on the part of an objective onlooker (*taṭastha*)?

Here, Kalhaṇa decries the difficulty of judgment. Even the common sense knowledge that the Pāṇḍavas are the heroes and the Dhārtarāṣṭras are the villains of the *Mahābhārata* is not so clear-cut on closer examination.

In one of his more cynical moments in the eighth *taraṅga* he compares the difficulty of finding a politically competent minister to the difficulty of grasping the plot of a tale. Kalhaṇa writes:

> *prabandhaṃ nirbadhnann arim upacarañ chāditaruṣaṃ*
> *mahāhiṃ saṃgṛhṇan nayakuṭilaceṣṭaṃ vyavaharan |*
> *sa bhūmiḥ siddhīnāṃ dadhad ucitakartavyaparatāṃ*
> *bhaved yo 'nirvyūḍhāv api sudṛḍhasaṃrambharabhasaḥ ||8.2606||*
> *[...]*
> *sa satyaṃ sacivo 'prāpyaḥ saṃgrahītuṃ pragalbhate |*

kathāśarīram iva yo nirvyūḍhau kāryam ākulam ||8.2608||

> Composing a work, serving an enemy who has hidden his rage, capturing a massive snake, engaging with behavior based on crooked dealings: in the very end, someone who may be violently eager with a firm resolve becomes the foundation to place due importance on what is proper and what is to be done for the attaining of success. Truly a minister who can boldly seize/put together a confused affair at its end is unobtainable like the plot (*śarīra*) of a story (*kathā*).

We are told at the very end that King Jayasiṃha had four sons, each named after a previous king of Kashmir. Jayāpīḍa and Lalitāditya are of course among the four, playing happily as boys as the poem closes.[125] The circular inevitability of history is always looming in the works of Kalhaṇa. This mode of history should not be confused with the much-vaunted cyclic notion of Hindu time, rather this is to be interpreted through Kalhāna's own *śāntarasa* derived ethics of history. Yet for such a philosophy of the past to become activated requires a certain distance from the events, the perspective of a *taṭastha*, one standing on the bank.

Perhaps such a viewpoint is in the end impossible. The eighth *taraṅga* of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* shows the difficulty of sustaining an aesthetic and moral organizing principle in the face of a messy and uncertain present. As in the verse quoted earlier, the streams of history come crashing down on the present, it is uncertain how anything will turn out. The confusion of the eighth *taraṅga* is the confusion of trying to force a pattern on the present. The well-defined streams of history feed and inform our interpretations, but are unable ultimately to give satisfactory structure to the unfinished present. In the end, Jonarāja informs us in his own *Rājataraṅgiṇī* that none of Jayasiṃha's sons end up on the throne. Neither Jayāpīḍa nor Lalitāditya earns a second chance.

2.4. Conclusion: The Precarious Undertaking of Representing the Present

In this chapter, I have highlighted a few aspects of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* which will continue to influence the writing of later Kashmiri historians. I first demonstrated that the label "history" when applied to Kalhaṇa must be seen as having its own particular Kashmiri genealogy, and must be understood as informed by certain moral presuppositions. I continue to argue that the designation poetry also must not be taken at face value, but rather be seen as an outgrowth of specific textual and cultural forms in the valley of Kashmir. The combination of this specific historical/ethical and literary/philosophical imagination becomes what was instantly recognizable to colonial scholars as history, even though its internal historiography was very much determined by Kashmiri culture in the twelfth century. Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* used the form and vocabulary drawn from Kashmiri intellectual culture to create a reflective way of talking about the past. This way of speaking was defined through the appropriation of

---

[125] See *RT* 8.3371-8.3379.

terminology invoking *rasa*—specifically *śāntarasa*. A *rasa*-based poetics, however, should not be seen as the only way to interpret the narrative; rather, in the first seven chapters Kalhaṇa deploys the metaphor of the wave for kingship; kings rise and fall, pushed up by their birth and natural brilliance and brought low by calamity or their own obsessions.

After the seventh book and the downfall of Harṣa, the clarity of the *rasa/taraṅga*-model begins to become more difficult to sustain, being complicated by the politics of the present. The text itself, with its different extant recensions points to the tentative and unfixed nature of the eighth *taraṅga*. I argue that the precariousness of the text itself points to an imperfect or impossible juxtaposition of the historiographical ideal introduced throughout the first chapters of the text and reaching its high-water mark in the story of Harṣa. In the eighth *taraṅga*, Kalhaṇa searches for a way to integrate his carefully-crafted aesthetic and moral philosophy with the more treacherous task of writing about the present. While Kalhaṇa's historiography does not in fact totally break down, the tensions are visible.

In the following chapters, I will turn to Kalhaṇa's successors: Jonarāja and especially Śrīvara. In these chapters I will argue that each of these authors searches to continue a certain reading of a "Kalhaṇian historiography", yet like Kalhaṇa's, their attempts to give shape to the lives of contemporary kings immediately become complicated by the question: how does one write a history of the world in which one lives? Kalhaṇa's successors too try to find a way to balance Kalhaṇa's normal historiography with patron-centered representations of court personalities. While it is clear that Jonarāja and Śrīvara were both under the patronage of the Sultanate court,[126] Kalhaṇa's extant works point to a complex and perhaps changing relationship.[127] Jonarāja's text, since it is incomplete, can only begin to point out the difficulties of reconciling a Sultanate present with the Sanskritic past. Śrīvara's dazzling textual innovations also try to bring a structured, coherent approach to understanding contemporary events. While Śrīvara is in fact able to construct such a model for the life

---

[126] The exact relationship of Jonarāja and Śrīvara with their Sultanate patrons is complicated. This will be discussed at greater length in chapters 5 and 6 respectively. Here I stress that Jonarāja and Śrīvara make their position as some sort of client to the ruling dynasty much more transparent.

[127] This relationship can perhaps be inferred from Kalhaṇa's appearance in two different texts: the aforementioned *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and Vallabha's anthology. In the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, it appears that Kalhaṇa is under the patronage of Alakadatta, about whom almost nothing is known. In his commentary on the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, Jonarāja identified Alakadatta as the *sāndhivigrahaka*, an official in charge of foreign affairs. This might be because of some confusion on Jonarāja's part, given that Maṅkha refers to his brother Laṅkaka in that office in *ŚKC* 3.62 and 25.61 while Kalhaṇa himself refers to Maṅkha holding this office in *RT* 8.3354. Further Stein argues convincingly that Kalhaṇa was not under the patronage of the reigning king Jayasiṃha. (See. Stein, 1900, p. 17.) In any case, Kalhaṇa is tied to one Alakadatta in the *ŚKC* while the anthology preserves a verse eulogizing Jayasiṃha in the manner of a court panegyrist. Stein further complicated this picture by attempting to trace to which notables Kalhaṇa shows favor in the eighth book and to which he seems averse. (*Ibid.*, p. 20.)

of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, his attempts at describing the lives of later rulers quickly become more and more disorganized.

In the end, Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* provides a vocabulary with which to talk about kingship deeply embedded in a formal structure that highlights the fickle hearts of kings and the transitory nature of good fortune. The *śloka*-based poetry, idea of *śānta*, and the *taraṅga* organizational scheme provided a powerful model to be adopted and adapted. However, this way of viewing and organizing events is always in danger of falling apart due to the pressure of the present, whose forces and pulls often threaten to undermine the very activity of historical narration.

Chapter 5: Jonarāja and the Sanskrit Poetic Tradition:

5.1. Introduction: Change, Continuity, and Rupture in Sultanate South Asia.

        This chapter leaves Kalhaṇa's twelfth-century world behind and jumps forward
over three hundred years to the reign of Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn (r. 1419/1420-1470).
Even within the relatively restricted geographical confines of the Kashmir valley, the
political and cultural changes encompassed in this leap are enormous. These three
centuries saw the collapse of the Second Lohara dynasty, a Mongol invasion, the almost
complete depopulation of the Valley, the establishment of Islam and Islamic institutions,
and the formation of a new ruling family. Historians know of this time primarily through
the writings of one Sanskrit poet and intellectual, Jonarāja. Most likely born in the first
decade of the fifteenth century,[128] Jonarāja's life spanned two of the most important and
controversial reigns of the Kashmiri Sultanate: that of Sikandar Shāh (r. 1389-1413) and
Zayn al-'Ābidīn (r. 1420-1470).[129] According to Jonarāja's account, Sultan Sikandar's
reign saw a massive persecution of Brahmins, while the ascension of Sultan Zayn saw the
restoration of Sanskrit learning in Kashmiri elite contexts. Jonarāja's work is
provocatively positioned between these two rulers, and between rupture and restoration.
        Jonarāja's project of revival simultaneously recognizes a real break in Kashmiri
history and society while presenting the multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, and multi-religious
Shāh Mīrī dynasty in an idiom based on the twelfth-century *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Jonarāja must
expand the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s scope and alter its underlying assumptions to create a new
form for the new elite dispensation of the Valley. According to Jonarāja, the Sultanate in
Kashmir is not an example of a foreign or imported Islamic ruling class placed over and
above a conquered Hindu people, rather Jonarāja's oeuvre points to a more complex and
tangled genealogy. His *Rājataraṅgiṇī* shows the foundation of the Shāh Mīrī Dynasty
and its later rule arising out of alliances between Muslims and Hindus (and even
Buddhists), native Kashmiris and immigrants, Tibetans, Central Asians, not to mention
different clans and factions within the Valley itself.
        The Sultanate period has never been studied in anything approaching the depth of
later political formations like the Mughal Empire. The reasons for this are manifold, yet
perhaps the most pertinent is that there was no lasting and cohesive pan-South Asian
political structure. One can perhaps speak of the Delhi Sultanate, yet this political
formation is anything but stable, and ignores the myriad smaller regional independent or
successor states. The Kashmiri instantiation of a regional Sultanate court is striking for
its Sanskrit literary production localizable to the reigns of several Sultans, especially
Zayn al-'Ābidīn. I read Jonarāja's literary output as actively negotiating a new place for

---

[128] Walter Slaje estimates that Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn and Jonarāja were born roughly
around the same time. Zayn is said to have been seventeen when he ascended to the
throne in 1420. See Slaje, "Three Bhaṭṭas, Two Sulṭāns, and the Kashmirian
Atharvaveda," in *The Atharvaveda and Its Paippalādaśākha: Historical and Philological
Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, ed. by Arlo Griffiths *et al.* (Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2007):
11.
[129] While Sikander's oldest son and Zayn's older brother, 'Alī Shāh ruled from 1413 until
his abdication in 1419, his reign will not be discussed here.

Sanskrit in changed political, social, and religious contexts. Jonarāja's revival of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* allows for the articulation of a certain regional Sultanate consciousness. His literary output makes Sanskrit an integral part of the vernacularizing world of the Sultanate and deeply imbricates in region-forming processes.

      With this focus, I discuss the Kashmiri Shāh Mīrī Sultanate not so much as a political formation but rather as an evolving elite audience for Sanskrit. The place of Sanskrit in this elite world remained unstable, and Sanskrit-producing intellectuals constantly negotiated new modes of expressions for new modes of elite representation. While this experimental attitude has been noted in the production of new and exciting literary and regional cultures in this period. Francesca Orsini has argued that a picture of the Sultanate world is not complete without looking at the vernacular worlds surrounding the power and cultural centers. This insight, coupled with Hardy's idea of the situatedness of the Islamicate sources leaves the Sultanate open to different perspectives from which to write its history.

      More than just an ethnically diverse polity, Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* hints at the complex make-up of courtly intellectual circles and patronage networks. At the beginning of his history he writes:

> *magnān vismṛtipāthodhāv atītān nṛpatīn imān* |
> *śrījainollābhadīnasya kāruṇyād ujjihīrṣataḥ* ||10||
> *sarvadharmādhikāreṣu niyuktasya dayāvataḥ* |
> *mukhāc chrīśiryabhaṭṭasya prāyājñām anavajñayā* ||11||
> *rājāvaliṃ pūrayituṃ samprati pratibhā mama* |
> *kavināmābhilāṣeṇa na tu yasmān mamodyamaḥ* ||12||

> From the mouth of the glorious Śiryabhaṭṭa, who as been entrusted with the administration of all legal matters [and who was] well-disposed toward me, I had received orders from the glorious [Sultan] Zayn al-'Ābidīn. It suggested itself to me to complete the lineage of kings right now, in compliance [with his orders]. It was because [Zayn], out of pity, wanted to rescue these past rulers, [who were] submerged in the ocean of oblivion. This is why my attempt is however not [made] in the desire of earning myself the name of a poet.

Two aspects of this passage deserve especial note: firstly, the number of people involved in the patronage process, and the "embeddedness" of it, and secondly, that Zayn uses this web of elites to root his own reign in the past. Zayn is the ultimate "source" but it comes via an intermediary, a Brahmin minister of the Sultan, Śiryabhaṭṭa, Zayn's chief legal officer (*dharmādhikāra*).[130] Śiryabhaṭṭa appears to have been an important advisor of Zayn, he is commemorated by Jonarāja and the later historical tradition as a learned scholar and healer, instrumental in the reinstatement of Hindu customs in the Valley. He is said to have cured Zayn of a painful boil and to have used his influence to facilitate the

---

[130] For the term *dharmādhikāra*, see Bühler, *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Mss. Made in Kashmir, Rajputana, and Central India* (London: Trübner and Co., 1877): 21.

return of exiled Kashmiri Brahmins Brahmins.[131] This hints toward a complex Sultanate elite, and that Jonarāja's patronage system was not confined to the king and his eulogist/chronicler but including a wider circle of officials.[132] Thinking beyond Sultan- or Brahmin-centered audiences and imagining a complex and multifaceted elite culture can perhaps help circumscribe a domain in which Jonarāja's work can be meaningful on multiple levels to multiple individuals and groups.

But how did Jonarāja take part in an "ecology of Sanskrit" in a Sultanate milieu? Why should the term "Sultanate" be meaningful as anything other than a temporal marker? Here I argue in favor of conceptualizing "Sultanate" not merely as a synonym for "state" or "dynasty" but rather as a cultural space populated by an elite literary public. This "public" is not to be understood as an inward-looking conservative Brahmanical intelligensia, rather Jonarāja's work is presented outward to a political elite—Hindu and Muslim—and concerns itself with issues at the core of Kashmiri rulership. Yet while this work is presented to a wider elite cultural world, Brahminical concerns are often central: Śaivism, the form of religion most prominent among Kashmiri Brahmins is highlighted, and the history of the Kashmiri Brahmin community often lurks behind the political history of the Sultanate kings.

Presenting such a radically expanded field for Sanskrit in the Sultanate period requires rethinking Sanskrit in the second millennium. Modern scholarship has tended to view the history of the premodern through lenses of religiously inflected nationalism. The case of Kashmir is especially fraught with difficulties given the present contested status of the land itself. The reading of Jonarāja too is largely overdetermined by the concept of *Kashmiriyat* or "Kashmiriness".[133] For historians such as Mohammad Ishaq Khan, the defining moment of *Kashmiriyat* occurred when the Kashmiri Islamic mystic Nund Rishi synthesized the Śaiva *bhakti* spirituality of Lal Ded with the Islam of the early Sufi missionaries (especially Mir Sayyid Ali Hamadānī). Khan argues that this combination of indigenous elements with great tradition of Islam creates a truly Kashmiri and truly Islamic culture that is based on social liberation. Those that do not take part in this vernacularizing and "democratizing" impulse are the conservative upholders of the bigoted Brahminical order.[134]

---

[131] Jonarāja does use the word *hinduka* to describe these refugees. For a fuller account of Śiryabhaṭṭa, see Slaje "Three Bhaṭṭas," esp. 7-11.

[132] The lack of a king centered Sanskrit court culture is, oddly enough, the marker for Pollock's famous "death of Sanskrit" in the context of Kashmir. Pollock locates this death in the twenty-fifth chapter of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* (to be discussed later in this chapter), which has ambassadors and court officials, but no king. I think instead of declaring Sanskrit "dead" at this point, one can see, as one sees here, a movement of Sanskrit into new spheres and new wider publics. See Sheldon Pollock, "The Death of Sanskrit," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43, 2 (2001): 392–426.

[133] The history of *kashmiriyat* has received some attention recently, for a history of this concept see especially Chitralekha Zutshi, *Languages of Belonging: Islam, Regional Identity, and the Making of Kashmir* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[134] Such an argument is made in even stronger terms by Yoginder Sikand. See for instance Yoginder Sikand, "Hazrat Bulbul Shah: The First Known Muslim Missionary in Kashmir," *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 20, 2 (2000): 361–367.

Khan points to Jonarāja's use of the word Brahmin to describe himself and his descriptions of idol-breaking and anti-brahmanical actions taken (especially by Sikander Shāh, Zayn's father) as evidence of his "religious ethnocentrism".[135] The caste-conscious Brahmin community is set against "the popular movement against the Brahmans for turning temples and idols into agencies of exploitation in the name of faith…"[136] This common narrative for explaining mass conversion to Islam, which Richard Eaton has termed the "Religion of Social Liberation thesis",[137] automatically presupposes an oppressed people who are liberated by the coming of Islam. This common and simplistic understanding has been ably critiqued in Eaton's work.[138] What is important here is that in such an understanding, Jonarāja's role is largely predetermined; he is a Brahmin speaking to Brahmin casteist interests. While Khan's reading of Jonarāja comes from a different perspective, he sees the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as indicative of processes in society at large rather than in the more limited confines of the elite court. Such a reading, and indeed such a historiography, elides the far more complex problematic of the role of a Śaiva Sanskrit scholar working in an increasingly Islamic (or perhaps better Islamicate) court.

Here I will concentrate upon his three commentaries on Sanskrit *mahākāvya*-s (the great poems of Sanskrit court literature) along with his history.[139] His commentaries hope to make intelligible the works of earlier Sanskrit poets: Bhāravi (seventh-eighth century), Maṅkha (twelfth century), and Jayanaka (twelfth century). I will argue that his concern for making the text easily understandable is tied to the common themes of these poems: Śaivism, Kashmir, history, and good kings. His history of the kings of Kashmir revitalizes the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre, and utilizes this form to integrate the ruptures and changes of the past into a narrative of a unified Kashmiri population under Sultan Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn.

Whether because the manuscript tradition has been defective (as in the case of his commentary on the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya*) or because the work itself was never completed (as in the case of his poetic history), when dealing with Jonarāja one must attempt to theorize a possible model for elite production on very speculative grounds. Given the fragmentary nature of the sources utilized in this chapter, I do not offer definitive conclusions but rather readings to expand the conceptual terrain into which Sanskrit can be placed. The investigation of Jonarāja will lay the ground for the works of Śrīvara and help delineate the possibilities for imagining a fluid and experimental ecology of Sanskrit in the Sultanate period.

---

[135] Mohammad Ishaq Khan, *Kashmir's Transition to Islam: The Role of Muslim Rishis, Fifteenth to Eighteenth Century* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers & Distributors, 1994): 81.

[136] *ibid.*

[137] Richard Maxwell Eaton, *The Rise of Islam and the Bengal Frontier, 1204-1760* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993):116-117. Eaton's chapter "Mass Conversion to Islam: Theories and Protagonists" is very useful for thinking through conversion in the Kashmiri context.

[138] See *ibid.* 117-119.

The study of Sanskrit intellectual culture under Islamicate rule in South Asia is in its infancy and careful studies of the dynamics of interaction between Sanskritic and Persianate elite traditions have only begun to be produced.[140] I stress that Sanskrit in the reign of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn was deeply imbricated in local forms of expression. Jonarāja's works were inflected by a specific regional imagination and requires thinking of other possibilities outside of Pollock's model of the first millennium Sanskrit cosmopolis; Jonarāja was not speaking to a rarefied a-temporal universe, but rather to a regionalized (and perhaps even vernacularized) elite multi-lingual and multi-religious "Sultanate public" of the court and elite circles.

5.2. Jonarāja on the *Kirātārjunīya* and *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita:* Sanskrit, Śaivism, and Place in Sultanate Kashmir.

Three commentaries of Jonarāja survive, those on the *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi, the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* of Maṅkha, and the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* of Jayanaka. Although the commentaries on the *Kirātārjunīya* and *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* are complete, only the commentary on the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* has been fully published[141] and only the first half of the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* is available in a highly lacunose manuscript missing the introductory verses. When put in the context of Zayn ul-ʿĀbidīn and a Muslim—or at lest Persianizing—court, these choices might seem rather strange. What can poems about epic heroes and the God Śiva, about the battle of Śiva against the flying city of the demons, and a historical epic about the defeat of Moḥammad Ghūr have in common? Further, what place can they have in a Muslim court? I suggest that Jonarāja attempts to break down these poems in simple language to provide a sort of *kāvya* canon for the multi-lingual and multi-ethnic Sultanate elite in Kashmir. These works highlight Śaivism (in the *Kirātārjunīya* and the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*), an emphasis on Kashmir (the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*[142]), a historical placing of poetry (the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya*), and kingship and martial valor (the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya*). I here concentrate on the two extant introductions to his commentaries to show his framing of his commentarial undertaking.

---

[140] The work of Audrey Truschke—especially her 2012 dissertation "Cosmopolitan Encounters" that highlights the interactions between the Sanskrit-using literati and the Mughal Court—is a notable exception.

[141] The *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* was published in the Kāvyamālā series, Maṅkha, *Śrīmaṅkhakaviviracitaṃ Śrīkaṇṭhacaritam: Jonarājakṛtayā Ṭīkayā Sametam* (Dillī: Motīlāla Banārasīdāsa, 1983). All quotes come here from this edition, however it must be noted that this text is often in need of improvement and cannot be seen as a critical edition of either Maṅkha's or Jonarāja's work. Viroopakshi Jaddipal at the Tirupati Rashtriya Samskrit Samsthan has been working on editing Jonarāja's commentary. All my quotations come from his text, which covers the first three *sarga*-s of the *Kirātārjunīya, Mahākavibhāraviprāṇītaṃ Kirātārjunīyam: Traisargikaṃ: Nṛsiṃha-Prakāśavarṣa-Jonarājakṛtābhiḥ ṭīkābhiḥ vibhūṣitam* (Dillī: Amara Grantha Pablikeśansa, 2008). I would like to thank Dr. Jaddipal for helping me obtain copies of his work.

[142] It is worth noting that Jayanaka too was in all probability also from the Valley. See Warder *Indian Kavya Literature*, 161.

Jonarāja's reading of Bhāravi's poem, the *Kirātārjunīya*, hints toward the complex situation behind its production. Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* is one of the five great *mahākāvya*-s canonized by later learned tradition. Based on an episode in the third book of the voluminous Sanskrit epic, the *Mahābhārata*,[143] it describes the epic hero Arjuna's penance in the Himalayas undertaken to obtain the blessings of Śiva and divine weapons for the impending war. To test the hero, the great God Śiva himself attacks Arjuna in battle in the guise of a wild mountain hunter (*kirāta*). Their duel ends with a draw, but Śiva is pleased and gives the warrior his blessing.[144]

The introduction to Jonarāja's commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya* is short, but provocative. He writes:

prasādagāmbhīryamanoramaśrī rasapravāhaṃ madhuraṃ sravantī |
sarasvatīvāstv atipuṇyalabhyā sarasvatī vo malaśodhanāya ||
śrīnonarājatanayaḥ kurujiccaritre
paryāyamātram abhidhāsyati jonarājaḥ |
kiṃ nāma nāmalamaṇipraguṇāṃs taṭāko
vyākośayaty udadhivat taralāṃs taraṅgān ||
śrījainollābadenasya sāṃrājye jonako dvijaḥ |
kharṣiviśvamite śāke yathāmati yatiṣyate ||

May Sarasvatī wash clean your impurities, may she be like a river (*sarasvatī*) to be obtained through incredible merit, flowing forth a sweet flood of *rasa*, beautiful with clarity, profundity, and charm.
The son of the illustrious Nonarāja, Jonarāja, will state merely synonymous meanings (*paryāya*) in regard to the deeds of the vanquisher of the Kurus (=Arjuna). Indeed, does not the pond contain (*vyākośayati*) trembling waves, excellent as stainless gems, just like the ocean?
In the reign of the illustrious Zayn al-Ābidīn, the twice-born [=Brahmin] Jonaka [=Jonarāja] will strive [to complete this commentary] in accordance with his intelligence in the Śāka year 1370 [=1448/9].

This commentary is striking for the number of bases it covers in a short time. The first verses praise the goddess of Speech, Sarasvatī, and present Jonarāja's lineage. At the same time, the image of the flowing river in these two stanzas thematically echoes to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and Jonarāja's historical project. The final verse gives a precise date for the composition of the commentary, and places that composition within the reign of Zayn. While not stating specifically that the Sultan ordered the work, it recognizes the political power (note the word *sāṃrājya*) of Zayn. Jonarāja also identifies himself as a Brahmin (*dvija*). The simultaneity of these factors is rare in Sanskrit commentarial literature and echo the complexity of elite interests at the time.

---

[143] The story of Arjuna's battle with Śiva disguised as a *kirāta* occupies chapters 34 to 41 of the third book of the *Mahābhārata*.
[144] For a full study of this poem, see Indira Viswanathan Peterson, *Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic: The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).

Jonarāja also insists that his commentary provides only the synonymous, syntactically simple meaning (*paryāyamātra*). Looking at the extent of the commentary, Jonarāja's is much more laconic than even his fellow Kashmiri Prakāśavarṣa's *Easy Gloss* (*Laghuṭīkā*). This glossing style is shown consistently throughout all of Jonarāja's poetic output. The original audience and purview of commentaries is rarely taken into consideration.[145] Further, modern university education and printed editions tend to valorize commentaries that highlight grammatical discussions of the texts at hand, and so Mallinātha's erudite takes on the canonical *mahākāvya*-s have become the standard portals through which students access the works of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, and Māgha. Mallinātha's *Ghaṇṭāpatha* on the *Kirātārjunīya* has so far eclipsed the fame of others that other commentaries—not only Jonarāja's but also the probable oldest extant commentary on Bhāravi, the Kashmiri Prakāśavarṣa's *Laghuṭīkā*[146]—have yet to be edited or published.

However, Jonarāja's avowed simplicity must be taken seriously; it would seem that Jonarāja's commentaries are written notes to aid the actual understanding of the text rather than didactic displays of grammatical expertise. Such an agenda highlights understanding the content of the poems themselves rather than on the intricacies of grammar. To this end, it seems that Jonarāja intends the *Kīrātārjunīya* to be intelligible, and places this all within a localized time of Zayn's rule.

The second *mahākāvya* commented upon by Jonarāja is the fascinating and understudied *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Maṅkha's dense poem runs to twenty-five chapters, yet is perhaps most interesting for its framing. Maṅkha begins his story with an elaborate description of the Valley and his family's position in the twelfth century Kashmiri elite world. Maṅkha then tells of a dream in which his father comes in the form of Ardhanārīśvara—the half-male half-female form of Śiva—and tells him to write a poem in praise of the gods. The body of the poem tells of the wonderful exploits of Śiva as he prepares for battle, marches forth, and ultimately destroys the city of the demons.[147] From the point of view of classical Sanskrit *kāvya* norms, the poem concludes in a rather unexpected way. The twenty-fifth chapter consists of Maṅkha himself presenting the poem to a gathering at the home of his brother. This *sabhā* consists of ambassadors, rhetoricians, and scholars—even Kalhaṇa makes an appearance.[148] Like the

---

[145] Deven Patel's study of the commentarial tradition on the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* is a notable exception.

[146] Prof. Viroopaksha Jaddipal at the Rashtriya Samskrit Samsthan in Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, is working on editing the *Laghuṭīkā* at the moment.

[147] The core of the story is found in the *Brahmaṇa* literature, see *Śatapathabrahmaṇa* III. 4.4.4 and *Aitreyabrahmaṇa* I.25, and is further fleshed out in the *Mahābhārata*, see *Karṇaparvan* 24. Many *purāṇa*-s include versions of this episode including the *Śivapurāṇa, Liṅgapurāṇa, Padmapurāṇa*, and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*.

[148] See Chapter Three for a translation of the verses dealing with Kalhaṇa. For a general outline of the contents of Maṅkha's *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, see Bankim Chandra Mandal, *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita, a Mahākāvya of Maṅkhaka: Literary Study with an Analysis of Social, Political, and Historical Data of Kashmir of the 12th Century A.D* (Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1991). For a study of the *sabhā* in the twenty-fifth chapter, see

Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi, this work shares a strong Śaiva inclination, but the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* centers Kashmir and personal experience in a Kashmiri intellectual sphere.

The introduction to the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* is Jonarāja's longest, consisting of five stanzas in a variety of meters. Jonarāja writes:

> *udeti yasyāṃ prakaṭībhavatyāṃ tirohitāyāṃ galatīva viśvam |*
> *raviprabhevāstu tamo harantī dṛśaḥ prabodhāya sarasvatī vaḥ ||*
> *śrīlaularājasutapaṇḍitabhaṭṭanona-*
> *rājātmajaḥ sahṛdayair vihitābhyanujñaḥ |*
> *kāvye purāricarite kurute 'bhiyogaṃ*
> *vācyārthamātravivṛttiṃ prati jonarājaḥ ||*
> *śeṣārthayor iha vihastitabālabodha-*
> *śraddhāpratītir araṇīsthahutāśatulyā |*
> *kaṣṭena yasya sucirād upatiṣṭhate 'nnaṃ*
> *māṃsaspṛhā bhavati tasya hi hāsahetuḥ ||*
> *lakṣyādinā kvacana saurabhamārabheya*
> *tadvācyapoṣakatayety avaseyam eva |*
> *arthavyayaṃ spṛśati parvasu yaddaridras*
> *tatkevalaṃ bhavati maṅgalabhaṅgabhīteḥ ||*
> *puropakāriṇaḥ santo yaśaḥpuṇyavivṛddhaye |*
> *sāvadhānā bhavantv atra mama skhalitayojane ||*

May Sarasvatī be for the awakening of your sight, may she be like the darkness-destroying the splendor of the sun, in whom everything rises which was seeming to slip away into obscurity.
Jonarja, the son of Pandit Bhaṭṭa Nonarāja, the son of the illustrious Laularāja, having been asked to make this commentary by poetry connoisseurs (*sahṛdayaiḥ*), exerted himself toward this commentary (*vivṛtti*) concerning merely the literal meaning (*vācyartha*) in the poem about the deeds of the enemy of the [triple] city (=Śiva).
In this work, the true understanding of the rest of the meaning (? *śeṣārtha*) on the part of those whose childlike intellects are confused is equal to the fire still inside the fire-sticks. Indeed, the desire for meat is a cause of ridicule on the part of one who has received food with difficulty after a long time.
May the Good , who were previously supportive, be attentive toward my own fumbling effort in order to increase fame and merit.

Here we have no explicit mention of Zayn or of any particular date, yet certain parallels emerge. The praising of Sarasvatī, the genealogical verse, and the stress on the simplicity of the style of the commentary is very much similar to that shown in the *Kirātārjunīya*. Here again Jonarāja states that he deals only with the literal meaning

---

Elisabeth Kreyenborg, "Der XXV. Gesang des Srikanthacaritam des Mankha. Ein Beitr. z. altind. Literaturgeschichte" (PhD. Dissertation, Universität Münster, 1929).

(*vācyārthamātravivṛttiṃ*), placing the understanding of Maṅkha's actual words at the forefront, rather than a grammatical exploration of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*'s diction. Jonarāja is presenting the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* as a poem to be understood, in its most literal and basic sense, which I argue can point toward its place in Kashmiri elite culture in Sultanate times.

This poem, like Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*, is focused upon the exploits of Śiva, specifically the story in which the Great God burns the Triple City of the demons. Both of these published commentarial works of Jonarāja share a strong sense of a Śaiva religious impulse, which is clearly seen in his commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya* and the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. In presenting commentaries on these two works, Jonarāja sought to foster an understanding of these great texts of the Sanskrit literary tradition, but one must also underline both the Śaiva orientation and the Kashmir- centeredness of the texts. Such a project could easily be placed within the contexts of a Kashmiri Sultanate court since it valorizes a specific regional high-cultural lineage, and also works that appealed to a Śaiva-leaning religious context. These threads tie together the commentarial project of Jonarāja, a project that can align wider Sultanate vernacularizing impulses in the court of Zayn.

5.3. Jonarāja on the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya: Yavanas*, *Mlecchas*, and Kings

The *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* of Jayanaka describes the defeat of Muḥammad Ghūr at the hands of Pṛthvīrāj Chauhān. Although Pṛthvīrāja lost definitively to Muḥammad Ghūr in 1192, he managed to beat back his adversary in 1191. It is this earlier battle that is commemorated in Jayanaka's poem, a strange interlude between the king's greatest glory and ultimate defeat.[149] Jayanaka probably completed the work around 1192 right before Pṛthvīrāja's final defeat. Jayanaka was presumably a Kashmiri Brahmin who, like the famous Bilhaṇa, wandered abroad in search of patronage.[150] In his influential article "The *Rāmayaṇa* and the Political Imagination," Sheldon Pollock argues that the text itself shows the formation of a nascent Hindu consciousness through the development of Rāmāyaṇa-based symbols and themes. For Pollock, the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* uses and adapts such models in order to express an ideal of Hindu kingship, one that is to be juxtaposed to the newly stabilized Islamic states in South Asia.[151] In his monograph *Representing the Other? Sanskrit Sources and the Muslims*, Brajdulal Chattopadhyaya devotes an entire appendix to refuting the underlying presuppositions of Pollock's article.[152] Such an intervention is helpful to untangling the dense web of categorical assumptions underlying

---

[149] The most in-depth summary of the available contents is found in volume 7.1 of Warder's *Indian Kāvya Literature*, 369-391. Despite (or perhaps because of) its provocative contents, this work has not received little of the scholarly attention it deserves.

[150] The *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* is preserved in a single incomplete Kashmiri manuscript. See Warder, 360-361.

[151] Sheldon Pollock, "Ramayana and Political Imagination in India," *Journal of Asian Studies* 52, 2 (1993): 261–297.

[152] Brajadulal Chattopadhyaya, *Representing the Other?: Sanskrit Sources and the Muslims (Eighth to Fourteenth Century)* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1998): 98-115.

post-colonial and post-nationalist understandings of political representation. Both Pollock and Chattopadhyaya's arguments are complicated by the fact that a Sultanate intellectual Jonarāja wrote a commentary on this work. Jonarāja's valorization of the text suggests that *the Pṛtvīrājavijaya* does speak to the world of fifteenth-century Sultanate elite culture in Kashmir.

So how are modern readers to understand Jonarāja's commentarial project in the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya*? Perhaps the simplest way would be to extend Ishaq Khan's characterization of Jonarāja as a bigoted and closed-minded Brahmin, writing only for his Hindu Brahminical community in the sacred Hindu language of Sanskrit to the exclusion of the Muslim population of Kashmir. This argument seems superficially to make sense: the poems are all religiously Hindu, and the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* seems to hold up Hindu kingship over the barbarian (Muslim) invaders. Yet such a view must be questioned because Jonarāja was active within a multi-religious Sultanate elite culture; perhaps the real power of the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* for Jonarāja and the Sultanate lies elsewhere.

While Jayanaka's poem does indeed understand a real cultural difference between the Ghūrid warriors and the army of Pṛthvīrāja, Jonarāja understands and contextualizes this difference in a way that might make sense within the Sultanate court. Given the paucity of available sources, together with the fact that Jonarāja's commentary on the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* is incomplete. It is hard to imagine a pandit who seeks and receives patronage from the state writing something valorizing a worldview that, following Pollock, adumbrates a nascent political Hinduism. Rather, I think the work might well be directed precisely at the court of Zayn ul-Ābidīn and that the valorization of Pṛthvīrāja might have another meaning encoded within it.

While a longer study of Jonarāja and the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* and its place in fifteenth century Kashmir is impossible here, I sketch a few possible ways to frame Jonarāja's attitude toward the text. Here I look at two explicit mentions of Muslims (either as invading barbarians or not) in the *Pṛthvīrājavijāya* and the way in which Jonarāja reads these references. One of the most striking occurs in Book Six of the *mahākāvya*, after the first encounter with Ghūrid forces. Here is Jayanaka's verse followed by Jonarāja's commentary:

> **marusthalīvālukayāpy adhatta**
> **kāṃścid vipannāṃl luṭhataḥ pṛthivyām |**
> **saṃskāram ātmocitam antakāle**
> **pravartantī kṛpayeva vātyā ||6.7||**
> mṛtān bhūmau luṭhato [']nyān vātasamūho marusikatayā cchādayat.
> atrotprekṣyate kṛpayā hetubhūtayā yavanocitaṃ pretasaṃskāraṃ
> bhūminikhananalakṣaṇaṃ pravartayantīva.[153]
> **[Pṛthvīrājavijāya of Jayanaka:]**
>
> **The wind, acting as if out of pity, covered [lit. "placed", cf. Jonarāja] some of the struck-down [soldiers] wallowing on the earth**

---

[153] *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* 6.7. Jayānaka's verse is in bold type while Jonarāja's commentary is in regular Roman. Here and throughout I cite from Ojha's edition: Jayānaka, *Pṛthvīrājavijayamahākāvyam* (Jodhapura: Rājasthānī Granthāgāra, 1997):150.

**with sand from the desert too, as if commencing the rite (*saṃskāra*)
that is appropriate for themselves (*ātmocita*) at the time of death.**
[Jonarāja's commentary:]
      The group of winds covered the other dead men wallowing on the
ground with gravel from the desert. In this verse, with compassion acting
as the cause there is a poetic fancy (*utprekṣā*) that they [=the winds] act as
if to commence the rites for the dead body (*pretasaṃskāra*) defined by the
burying [of it] within the earth as is appropriate for Muslims (*yavanocita*).

Note the use of the word *yavana* in the commentarial context. This word is not used by
Jayanaka in his own verse, but rather is added to explicate the meaning of the verse.
Jonarāja identifies the figure of speech as poetic fancy (*utprekṣā*) in which the wind is
fancifully imagined to be compassionate towards fallen Muslim soldiers and to give them
the rite demanded by their religion, a burial. Jonarāja's adding of the word *yavana* is
completely appropriate here, in that it lets the reader know exactly who such a rite is
appropriate for. Yet of all the terms available for "Muslim" that could be used like
turuṣka, *mleccha*, *tājika*, and so on, Jonarāja chooses *yavana*. I think this points toward a
fine distinction in Jonarāja's works, between the value-neutral word *yavana* which
expresses a religious and cultural bearing to the word *mleccha*, which has the negative
connotations for a destructive or barbaric (Muslim) person.
      Jonarāja and Śrīvara share a great curiosity for Islamic culture and new people
and objects from beyond the Valley. In fact, both of them include asides within their
histories on Muslim burial practices, which for them is a necessary life ritual for their
community (Jonarāja here calls it a *pretasaṃskāra*, "a rite for a dead man"), he uses the
yavana almost like a term for *jāti* or caste. In other words, Jonarāja and Śrīvara seem to
use *yavana* not as a term of the incomprehensible Muslim other, but rather for a group
that is coherent, with its own *saṃskāra*-s, having its own beliefs and practices which may
be illogical, but not inimical, to brahminical ideas.
      This *yavana* is implicitly contrasted in Jonarāja's commentary to the *mleccha*, the
barbarian, the implacable dangerous other. At another point in the narrative, the aptness
of Moḥammad Ghūrī's name is described. Jayanaka writes:

> *bhāṣādoṣavaśād girāṃ balarajastomair diśām ambhasām*
> *akṣṇāṃ bhānurucāṃ ca duṣkṛtabharā[ddyā]vāpṛthivor api |*
> *kāṭhinyāt kuliśasya mārakaphalāsaṅgādiṣūṇāṃ vadhād*
> *dhenūnāṃ [ca] dharaṇy arodhi daśadhā [tathyā]bhidhair goribhiḥ ||*[154]

> **Because of the faults in the speaking of their words*, through the
> great heaps of dust that occlude the horizon*, the waters*, the eyes*,
> the rays* of the sun, and heaven and earth*, through the slaying of
> cattle* through the hardness*, of their weapons* and through
> covering the earth*, in these ten ways they deserved the name Gori.**

---

[154] *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* 10.47, p. 256. The bracketed text is restored conjecturally by the
editors.

Jonarāja here describes each of these ten in detail. The trick is that Sanskrit lexicography developed resources for etymologizing and using similar phonetic shapes with very different meanings. Although it is not stated in the verse above, each of the words that I have starred can be expressed by the syllable *go*. The word *ari* means "enemy" so the syllables *go* and *ari* would coalesce giving the sound *gori*. The laws of Sanskrit compounding allow each compound to be understood as "the enemy of *go* (when *go* means the earth, speech, cows etc.)" or "the enemy with *go* (when *go* means weapon or hardness)." In this commentary Jonarāja uses these ten meanings as the definition of *mleccha*, or barbarian.

We have seen earlier that the term *yavana* is used almost flavorlessly to describe Islamic customs, but here the barbarian side is defined. To Jonarāja, *mlecchas* oppress the earth and kill cows, use unrefined speech, and rely on force of arms. Here I think Jonarāja is drawing a line, using the term *mleccha* versus the term *yavana* to show a specific difference in action. *Yavanas* have their own customs and religion, *mlecchas* are *yavanas* acting violently out of line. Jonarāja sees Moḥammad Ghūr as the enemy not because he is a Muslim, but because he acts in a particular way.

The *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* remains something of a blank slate in modern historiography, able to be written over and interpreted by the categories and concerns of the scholars involved. Perhaps it must remain so until a more detailed study of the text and its contents are made, or if by some stroke of luck a more complete manuscript of the poem is found. Here however, we must imagine Jonarāja himself as part of a similar process of interpretation and appropriation, one set in motion in a different era and governed by different presumptions and preoccupations, but one nonetheless interested in making the text intelligible to an actual audience, situated in an actual historical context. This claim seems uncontestable. The problem remains about how to read the text to uncover the traces of the politics of exegesis in Sultanate Kashmir.

Given the nature of the evidence (commentarial Sanskrit) and its fragmentary state, drawing out a historical narrative is impossible. Yet it is clear that the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* does not necessarily have to be about Hindus and Muslims, rather is about kingship. This is inflected throughout the work by a ruler's duty toward the religious community of his followers. Maḥmūd Ghūr becomes a *mleccha* not necessarily by religion, but by his actions. By reading in these distinctions (remember *yavana* and *mleccha* are added by Jonarāja, they are not used in the text by Jayanaka himself) Jonarāja is subtly and persuasively making a point about communities and rulers.

5.4. Jonarāja and the Kashmiri Historical Tradition: Year Zero and the Sultanate

While Jonarāja's commentarial oeuvre hints toward a complex sultanate elite audience, his historical poem speaks to and of the elite sultanate world directly. Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* functions as a continuation or supplementation of Kalhaṇa's original *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, both defined by Kalhaṇa's own text while constantly pushing the limits of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s historiography. The political, social, and literary world of the Shāh Mīrī sultanate opens a space for a new political and social imagination and Jonarāja's work turns to Kalhaṇa's text to integrate real and endemic transformation while simultaneously providing a narrative of rulers leading to and culminating in the reign of Zayn al-ʾĀbidīn. Jonarāja's own Zayn-centered teleology shows a definite turn

towards a patron-centered model which later becomes the basis for Śrīvara's own life of Zayn. In an interesting inversion, Jonarāja's tale is not defined by a Kalhaṇa-like rise and fall, rather Jonarāja's history is one of fall and rise, pointing toward[155] the ultimate goal, Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn.

Before turning to the contents of Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, its textual history must be rehearsed. From Śrīvara's testimony it is clear that Jonarāja died suddenly and that his *Rājataraṅgiṇī* was never officially completed.[156] This difficulty is compounded by the fact that the manuscript transmission itself shows a substantial rewriting. Two recensions of Jonarāja's history exist, one in the regional Kashmiri Śāradā script and the other in the transregional North Indian Devanāgarī script. The Devanāgarī recension contains around three hundred and fifty interpolated verses absent in the shorter Śāradā recension. The problem of finding an original text is compounded by the fact that Jonarāja died suddenly and left his text incomplete.[157] Walter Slaje outlines the textual history of Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*:

> The relationship between the two chroniclers [Jonarāja and pseudo-Jonarāja] is, in short, the following: Jonarāja's original text breaks off in AD 1458/9, the year of the author's death. This is the so-called shorter, or Śāradā recension in 967 verses published in the Calcutta edition (1835) of all the four Rājataraṅgiṇīs. There is also a longer, Nāgarī recension (Bombay 1896) enlarged by some 350 verses, which had to be interpolated in the later half of the 16th century. They seem to have been taken from independent and remarkably reliable Sanskrit sources, and should be accorded, serious weight.[158]

Much research remains to be done on the relationship between the texts of Jonarāja and pseudo-Jonarāja. The existence of the Nāgarī recension is especially interesting given the ability of Nāgarī manuscripts to be legible across a wider swathe of North India and their appearance in the latter half of the sixteenth century at the time of the incorporation of Kashmir into the Mughal Empire, however since this chapter concerns itself with Jonarāja as a sort of public intellectual at the court of Zayn, a historicization of the reception, use, and expansion of the chronicle is beyond the scope of this discussion. In this chapter's evaluation of Jonarāja and his writings, I have only quoted the Śāradā recension since it seems that the shorter version was indeed supplemented, rather than the longer version being edited.[159] It seems that many of the additions of pseudo-Jonarāja

---

[155] Again it is important to note that given the incomplete nature of Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* we can only speak of tendencies, since the work has not been transmitted in a final form.

[156] See chapter 6 for a discussion of Jonarāja's death and Śrīvara's continuation of the life of Zayn.

[157] See Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, 1.1.5-1.1.6, discussed in Chapter Six.

[158] Walter Slaje, "Three Bhaṭṭas" 1-2.

[159] See the Introduction of Walter Slaje's edition and translation of Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, *Kingship in Kaśmīr (AD 1148-1459) From the Pen of Jonarāja, Court*

were intended to give the text more structure, and to provide something like chapter headings.[160] Even with this caveat it seems that the pre-Zayn portions of his *Rājataraṅgiṇī* were in a fairly final form at the time of Jonarāja's death.

Here I focus on two sections from Jonarāja's account of pre-Zayn Kashmir: the disintegration of the political structure of the Valley after the Mongol invasion and the persecution of Brahmins during the reign of Zayn's father Sikander Shāh. Each of these ruptures allow a new dispensation: the invasion of Zulju leads to the coronation of the Ladakhi Rinchen as Sultan and foundation of the Shāh Mīrī Dynasty while the exiling of the Brahmins instigated by Sūha Bhaṭṭa give way to the new golden age under the Sultan Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn. To return to the discussion of rupture in Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, it seems that two "low points" of almost complete annihilation serve focal points in the structure of the narrative. The first, the invasion of the Mongol Zulju, serves to demarcate the arrival into a new era, the land of Kalhaṇa's poem has been changed forever, and a new beginning is at hand.

After detailing the dissolution of the Lohara Dynasty, the subject of Kalhaṇa's last book, the invasion of the Mongols, and the subsequent depopulation of the Valley, Jonarāja writes:

> *mitalokā khilakṣetrā nirbhojyā darbhanirbharā |*
> *sargārambha iva prāyas tadā kaśmīrabhūr abhūt ||JRT 162||*

> The people decimated, the fields wastelands,
> Uncultivated,
> Completely overgrown with grass,
> At that time by and large the land of Kashmir
> Was as if at the beginning of creation.

This verse uses almost eschatological language of *yuga* theory, which outlines the periodic destruction and recreation of the world. This evocative verse underlines the rupture between Kalhaṇa's Loharas and the new Sultanate. The break is almost absolute (the Sanskrit *prāyaḥ* "mostly, by and large" perhaps leaves room for some continuity), and Jonarāja describes a new world in which Sultanate can make a clean start. Indeed the term Sultan (Sanskrit *suratrāṇa*[161]) makes its first appearance describing the Ladakhi Buddhist warlord Rinchen before his conversion to Islam.[162] The formation of a new ruling dynasty comprised of Muslim migrants from Central Asia, Ladakhi Buddhists, and

---

Paṇḍit to Sulṭān Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn. Ed. and trans. by Walter Slaje (Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittemberg, 2014).

[160] For an example of this, see for instance the addition after verse 611 of two verses in ornate *kāvya* meters before the reign of ʿAlī Shāh, Zayn's older brother, to suggest the beginning of a new chapter of text, and indeed history. Such an ornate verse marking a transition is also in the Śāradā recension marking the coronation of Shāh Mīr. See Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, v. 308, discussed below.

[161] On the word *suratrāṇa* in Sanskrit, see Finbarr Flood, *Objects of Translation* and Philip Wagoner, "'Sultan Among Hindu Kings'."

[162] See Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, v. 174.

Hindu Kashmiri gentry after the Mongol end of the world starts a new cycle of history, that moves towards the personality of Sultan Zayn and a new imagination of history and polity in Kashmir.

One of the most important moments for contemporary historians in Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* concerns the reign of Sikandar Shāh, Sultan Zayn's father and predecessor. Within the Persian historiographic tradition, Sikandar is known as *butshikān*, the breaker of idols, and his reign is remembered as an "Islamicizing" or "*shariah*-izing" period of Kashmiri history. However, placing Sikandar Shāh is especially difficult within the context of a historical narrative conditioned by modern political concerns and categories. While scholars such as Mohammad Ishaq Khan and Yoginder Sikand paint Jonarāja as a biased Brahmin who, jealous of the egalitarian reformist potential of Islam, fabricated a tale of a violent and expansionistic Islam oppressing the people of Kashmir.

Here I quote from Jonarāja's version of Sikandar and Sūha Bhaṭṭa's persecution of the Brahmin communities at some length to show the complexity built into Jonarāja's argument and the way in which Jonarāja apportions blame to the various actors in the tale. Jonarāja writes:

> śyeno hanti patatriṇo mṛgapatir niṣpātayiṣṇur mṛgān
> bhidyante maṇayo'pi vajramaṇinā khātā khanitrair mahī |
> puṣpāṇīva ca bhāsvatā grahagaṇās sūryeṇa nirdhūnitāḥ
> prāyenātra vilokyate paribhavatrāsaḥ sajātīyataḥ ||651||
> dvijātipīḍane 'nena prerito 'pi muhur muhuḥ |
> śrīsekandarabhūpālaḥ karuṇākomalāśayaḥ ||652||
> yavanābdhimahāvelāṃ yām akārṣīt kathañcana |
> ullaṅghitā dvijātīnāṃ tena daṇḍasthitis tataḥ ||653||
> darśanāntaravidveṣī pradoṣas tamasāṃ nidhiḥ |
> yāgayātrādi nāgānāṃ durvṛttas sa nyavārayat ||654||
> śaṅkamānaḥ kṛtātaṅkasaṅkocānāṃ dvijanmanām |
> videśagamanāj jātirakṣām akṣāmamatsaraḥ ||655||
> mokṣākṣaraṃ vinā mārgo dātavyo naiva kasyacit |
> ity ādiśad aśeṣān sa mārgarakṣādhikariṇaḥ ||656||
> tato mīnān iva vyādho dattabandhe sarijjale |
> dvijātīn atidurjāto deśe 'smin nyagrahīttarām ||657||
> tadbhayānalasantāpaṃ pāpaṃ ca bahavo dvijāḥ |
> agnijvālāpraveśena sahasaiva nyavārayan ||658||
> kecid viṣena pāśena pare toyena cāpare |
> bhṛguṇā vahniṇā cānye viprā bhītyā vipedire ||659||
> rājadrohasahasreṇa rakṣituṃ rājavallabhāḥ |
> na tv ekam aśakan vipram etasmin dveṣadūṣite ||660||
> durvahatvena nindan sa rājyabhāram alaṃ khalaḥ |
> aślāghata dvijākrandaśravaṇānandalābhataḥ ||661||
> gṛhād dhūmyeva viprāṇāṃ paṅktir jātyabhimāninī |
> ruddhadvārāt tato deśād apamārgair apāsarat ||662||
> tyaktvāpi pitaraṃ putras taṃ pitā cāgamad dvijaḥ |
> sūhāntake kṛtākṣepe videśaṃ paralokavat ||663||
> kṣmā rūkṣā kṣāmam aśanaṃ vyāyāmo vedanāmayaḥ |

jīvannakarakatāṃ teṣāṃ videśo 'gād dvijanmanām ||664||
dhāṭīphaṇīndrabhītīvratāpasvalpāśanāturaiḥ |
marge 'nekair dvijair mṛtyulābhāt sukham amanyata ||665||
kva ca snānaṃ kva ca dhyānaṃ tapaḥ kva ca japaḥ kva ca |
bhikṣārtham aṭatāṃ grāmān agāt kālo dvijanmanām ||666||
dvijānām upakāro 'bhūd apakāramukhād aho |
yat tan nirvāsitās sarve pāpaṃ tīrtheṣv anāśayan ||667||
videśam agatāś śuṣyatkalatratrāṇacintayā |
mlecchaveṣā dvijāḥ kecit kaśmīreṣv eva cābhraman ||668||
vicchetum icchatā vidyāṃ tenāpahatavṛttibhiḥ |
laḍitaṃ prativeśmāgraṃ piṇḍīlabhād dvijaiś śvavat ||669||
turuṣkadarśane bhaktyā na tu dveṣeṇa sa dvijān |
vyaplāvayad ataś cāsmin hatyā na prajagalbhire ||670||
ity ākhyac ca evaiṣāṃ sa tasya parihāradaḥ |
dveṣadyotanaśaktānāṃ kāryāṇām eva darśanāt ||671||
ratnākaraṃ yam āśritya brāhmaṇā jagatībhṛtaḥ |
pakṣarakṣāṃ vyadhus so'bhūt kṣudrabhaṭṭo'sya vallabhaḥ ||672||
ratnākaraṃ yam āśritya brāhmaṇā jagatībhṛtaḥ |
pakṣarakṣāṃ vyadhus so'bhūt kṣudrabhaṭṭo'sya vallabhaḥ ||672||
malānordīnanāmānaṃ yavanānāṃ paraṃ gurum |
vaidagdhyāc chaṅkamānas sa drohīti tam abandhayat ||673||
yataḥ prabhṛti sa prāpad rājyam acchattracāmaram |
tataḥ prabhṛti rogārtir iva darśanadūṣaṇā ||674||
svapne'pi nātyajat sūhabhaṭṭaṃ ghaṭṭitavairiṇam |
bhogas sadvāsanā cātiśuddhānāṃ tapasāṃ phalam ||675||

The hawk slays birds, the lion yearns
        to strike down game;
Gems too are scratched by diamonds,
        the earth is dug up by spades.
Furthermore, like flowers, the planets
        are blanched out (*nirdhūnita*)
        by the brightly-shining sun.
As a rule, here [in the world] the terror of injury
Comes to be [only] from one's own kind (*sajātīya*).
        Although he had been instigated repeatedly by him [=Bhaṭṭa Sūha]
to oppress the Brahmins (*dvijāti*), the illustrious King Sikandar remained
compassionately and tenderly disposed [towards them]. That ordinance of
a fine (*daṇḍasthiti*) which [Sikandara] had somehow made into a great
dike against the ocean of Muslims (*yavana*) was violated by him [Sūha]
after that.[163] The wicked [Sūhabhaṭṭa], a sinful storehouse of darkness

---

[163] This verse remains unclear to me. The idea seems to be that there was some sort of
legal differentiation of status built on a fine (*daṇḍasthiti,* probably in the form of *jizya*),
after paying which the Brahmins could do as they pleased. Slaje understands it slightly
differently. He translates: "The big wall [Sikandar] had built against the Muslim flood

(*tamas*), full of spite for all other creeds (*darśana*), put an end to sacrifices, pilgrimages, and the like for the Nāgas.[164] Suspecting that the Brahmins, terrified by the horror (*ātaṅka*) perpetrated by him would protect their caste by fleeing to other countries, he instructed all of the officers guarding the mountain passes to let no one exit without exit papers (*mokṣākṣara*).

As a fisherman catches fish when the water of a river is blocked, [so] this exceedingly depraved person kept back the Brahmins in this country. Many Brahmins avoided the torture [that would have resulted from] the fire of [Sūha's] terror and the defilement (*pāpa*)[165] by entering into the fire's flames. Out of fear, some Brahmins perished by poison, some by the rope, and still others by water; others by a [fall] from the cliff or others by fire.[166] Through thousands of treacheries (*droha*) against the king[167] [even] the King's favorites were unable to protect a single

---

was somehow stepped over later by [Sūha] in the form of a fine decree for Brahmins." *Kingship in Kaśmīr*, 185. However, it seems to me that the relative *yām* in *pada* b must correlate with the feminine *daṇḍasthiti* in *pada* d so that the *daṇḍasthiti* was in fact the *mahāvelā*, meaning that Sikandar had previously kept the communities separate and self-contained, whereas, following the image of a breach in the dike, Sūha wiped out that differentiation. Another possibility is to take *ullaṅghita* as simply "stepped over" so perhaps this refers to Sūha's conversion to Islam.

[164] Nāgas are the autochthonic guardian spirits of the Kashmir Valley, believed to inhabit springs, lakes, and other low-lying areas.

[165] It seems to me that the *pāpa* mentioned by Jonarāja is forcible conversion. This justifies the lesser evil of committing suicide. Here Jonarāja contrasts the torture (*santāpa*, from *saṃ+√tap*, at its root level "to heat thoroughly, to scorch") by Sūha Bhaṭṭa's fire (*anala*) with the purifying fire (*agni*, the normal term also used for the God of Fire) of self-immolation.

[166] Jonarāja here places the grammatical agents (*kartṛ*) in the instrumental case; thus, poison, the noose, water, the fall from the cliff, and the fire are the agents of their death, and the Brahmins themselves are slightly distanced from the sin of suicide. Following this idea, I understand "a [fall] from a cliff" rather than "a [jump] from a cliff" to follow Jonarāja's own deemphasis of intention.

[167] The phrase *rājadrohasahasreṇa* is difficult to understand with precision, and leaves itself open to interpretation. The key term is *droha* in *rājadroha*. Monier-Williams defines the compound as "oppression, tyranny, rebellion," so perhaps the whole line could be understood as "through a thousand oppressions." However, the word could be read as a *tatpuruṣa* compound as I have translated it here. The term *rājadroha* comes in a list of five great crimes in the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*:

> *kulastrīvyabhicāraṃ ca rāṣṭrasya ca vimardanam |*
> *brahmahatyāṃ ca cauryaṃ ca rājadrohaṃ ca pañcamam ||*

Brahmin as long as [Sūha] was consumed by hatred. [While] the wicked [Sūha Bhaṭṭa] blamed the burden of ruling (*rājyabhāra*) since it was difficult to bear, he [actually] boasted of getting joy from the hearing the lamentations of the Brahmins.

Like smoke from a house, lines of Brahmins upholding their caste floated away on the lesser-known paths (*apamārga*) from the country, since the gates[168] had been blocked. As a son abandoning his father, [or] a father the son—a Brahmin went abroad as if to the next world, while Sūha, as Death [personified], reviled [him]. [Outside of Kashmir,] the land was arid, the food scarce, and their exertion was agonizing. Foreign lands became a living hell for the Brahmins. Many Brahmins on the road, tortured by attacks, the danger from snakes, the terrible heat, and the scarcity of food considered the attainment of death a pleasure. How far away seemed the ritual baths, their contemplation, austerities, and prayer! The Brahmins spent their time wandering to villages, begging for alms. Yet, what started as an offence turned into a benefit for the Brahmins, because all the exiles destroyed their sins at places of pilgrimage.

There were some Brahmins who concerned about the safety of their languishing wives did not emigrate, but wandered amongst the Kashmiris in the guise of Muslims (*mleccha*). With the intention of destroying learning, [Sūha] deprived the Brahmins of their livelihood. Like dogs waiting for a morsel, they put their tongues out in front of every house. However [Sūha] himself explained to them that he had destroyed the Brahmins, merely out of his devotion to the world view (*darśana*) of the Turks (*turuṣka*), not because he hated [them]. But he provided evidence against this, for the results that manifest his hate are visible. Reminiscent of the mountains, having sought shelter in the ocean to safeguard their wings, the Brahmins, props of the world, had sought the help of Kṣudrabhaṭṭa, [like the ocean] a source of gems, to support their party, [because] he was [still] his [Sikandar's?] favorite.

The leading authority of the Muslims (*yavana*) was called Mullā Nūr [ud-]Dīn. As Sūha was very discerning, he suspected him of treachery and so had him imprisoned. Ever since Sūhabhaṭṭa attained

---

The violation of a woman of a good family, the devastation of a country, the killing of a Brahmin, thievery, and treachery against the king (*rājadroha*) are the five [great crimes].

And thus my understanding of the term as meaning Sūha Bhaṭṭa's continuous small acts of subversion designed to turn Sikandar away from his previous Brahmin favorites. Walter Slaje understands this verse differently, and translates: "As long as [Sūha] was consumed by hatred, the [late] Sultan's favorites were unable to protect any of the Brahmins even at [the expense of] a thousand treacheries to the [then] ruler." See Slaje, *Kingship in Kaśmīr*, 185. "[E]ven at [the expense of] a thousand treacheries to the [then] ruler" is his translation of *rājadrohasahasreṇa*.

[168] Skt. *dvārāḥ*. The four main "gates" of Kashmir are the passes of Vārāhamūla, Toṣamaidān, Śūrapūra, and Śāradāsthāna.

power, even without [the royal insignia of] parasols and chowries, the spoiling of their *darśana* never left him, like an aching disease, not even in dream, after he had begun his campaign. Happiness, accompanied by a good mental disposition, is the fruit of only pure austerities.

This long passage details one of the most important, and controversial moments in the history of Sultanate Kashmir: the persecution of the Brahmins. Some authors, like Mohammad Ishaq Khan simultaneously imply that the Brahmins like Jonarāja described the violence and privation of this period in exaggerated terms, and that Brahmins in some way deserved this treatment because of their previous casteist oppression of the people.[169] Yet again, a careful reading of the actual text of Jonarāja supplies a more nuanced view of religion, caste, and violence in Sultanate Kashmir.

 Jonarāja begins this account with a gnomic verse in an elaborate *kāvya* meter, stating in essence, that only like can harm like: hawks kill doves, diamonds cut gems,[170] and so forth. In this account he is not blaming Islam *per se*, or even the Muslims as a community for the persecution of the Brahmins, rather he places the blame on one man, Sūha Bhaṭṭa, a Brahmin minister who converted to Islam, as the author and driving political and ideological force behind the violence toward and exile of the Brahmin community. Jonarāja pointedly does not use Sūha Bhaṭṭa's Muslim name (Mālik Saif ad-Dīn, supplied by the Persian histories) but rather identifies him with the appropriate brahminical caste surname (Bhaṭṭa) on his name to show his true community. In this way, just as a hawk preys on doves, so also did Sūha prey on the Brahmins. Jonarāja is explicit that Sikandar did not act without the all-important instigation (*preraṇa*) of the Sūha Bhaṭṭa.

 It is also important that Sūha's fury was not limited to the Brahmins, we see too a Muslim scholar (notably called a *yavana*) who also bore the brunt of Sūha's wrath. Jonarāja carefully absolves the Sultan of all guilt and places it upon one man, a man with a peculiar conflict of identity. By fixating on the caste of Jonarāja, Khan is right in a certain way, but I think wrong in a more important and larger sense. Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is directed towards a world of Bhaṭṭas and *yavanas*, and his goal is not to prove the superiority of one over the other, but to provide a history of kingship and power that allows for their coexistence. This coexistence definitely colored and qualified by Jonarāja's experience but was also directed toward defining a new *Kashmiriyat* in the court of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn.

5.5. Conclusion: Jonarāja and Sultan Zayn

 Reading Jonarāja's account of the life of Sultan Zayn can be a confusing affair; the work starts to become more episodic and fragmentary, the interpolated material becomes more common, and the narrative gradually trickles out. It is in this unfinished tangle that the heart of Jonarāja's project lies, or at least was supposed to lie. Trying to recover Jonarāja's central point from the available material is difficult, if not impossible.

---

[169] Khan, *Kashmir's Transition to Islam*, 80-85.

[170] The connection here is made very explicit, he uses the word *maṇi* for "gem", and the word *vajramaṇi* or "diamond-gem" for more common *vajra*.

However, one idea seems to unite all of Jonarāja's discussion of Zayn: that of recovery. Jonarāja recognized his world as irrevocably changed and found in the reign of Zayn al-'Ābidīn an idealized stability. In describing this, Jonarāja sees Zayn as correcting the excesses of the previous reign instigated by Bhaṭṭa Sūha. By using the carefully demarcated vocabulary of the chaotic and violent *mleccha*-s and *turuṣka*-s versus the *yavana* forces for stability, Jonarāja argues that Zayn offers a new way forward. Jonarāja's ideal of recovery is also paradoxically a narrative of newness; for instance, Jonarāja writes the coronation of Zayn as something that is both a return and something unprecedented. He writes:

> *rājā vaṇig ivātyarthyaṃ tulāyāḥ puṭayor iva |*
> *sāmyabhaṅgaṃ darśanayor nākṣamiṣṭa kathañcana ||769||*
> *śānte siddhāśrame siṃhair mṛgā iva na pīḍitāḥ |*
> *turuṣkaiḥ puṣkalabhayair brāhmaṇāḥ pūrvavat tadā ||770||*
> *doṣākareṇa sūhena yeṣāṃ saṅkocitā sthitiḥ |*
> *vyakāsayat tato bhāsvān guṇinas tān mahīpatiḥ ||772||*
> *[...]*
> *ahaṅkārāgadaṅkāro rājā prakṛtivṛddhaye |*
> *darśanānāṃ sa dhātūnām ivolbaṇam aśiśamat ||774||*
> *kaler dharmeṇa balinā mātsyanyāyāpravartanam |*
> *aṣṭalokeśatejo'ṃśadhāraṇasyāsya lakṣaṇam ||775||*
> *sa sūhabhaṭṭasaṃsparśaduṣṭāyāḥ śuddhaye bhuvaḥ |*
> *pratāpāgniṃ dhruvaṃ dīptamahākāśam ajijvalat ||776||*

> Like a merchant in respect to the two sides of a balance, the king would not tolerate any excessive imbalance of religious world views (*darśana*) at all. At that time as before the Brahmins were no longer oppressed by the Turks (*turuṣka*) who had become extremely frightened as if they were deer in a peaceful (*śānta*) ashram of perfected holy men, no longer struck down by lions. Then the king [like] the sun made the good, who had been made to shrivel by Sūha in the form of the moon, blossom forth. […] In order to increase [the prosperity] of his subjects, the king, a physician for egoism, put an end to the multitude of religious views like [a physician puts an end to the excess] of bodily humors. The operation of the Kali *yuga*'s rule that "the big fish eats the little one" was stopped by this strong [king] who was righteousness (*dharma*). He was defined as one who bore portions of the fiery brilliance of the eight Guardians of the World. Surely he lit the fire of his glory which blazed in the vast ether in order to purify the earth from the touch of Bhaṭṭa Sūha.

Zayn is here portrayed as restoring a balance that had been destroyed by Bhaṭṭa Sūha's persecutions of the Brahmins.

For Jonarāja then, Kashmir under Sultan Zayn is more than a political structure of Muslim government atop a Hindu society. Rather the important intervention of the Sultanate is the creation of a shared elite cultural space in the making. However, not all Sultanates work in the same way, rather each reflects and draws upon the peculiarities of

local histories and cultural forms. In the making of this space, Jonarāja engages in a project that not only draws upon a known literary canon but also upon the Valley's past to outline correct kingship, correct behavior for different elite groups—Brahmin and Muslim. The fragments I focus on from Jonaraja's writings are necessarily being considered in a vacuum. One must assume, however, that they would have once been part of a larger fabric of debates about what the Kashmiri Sultanate should be.[171]

The issue of correct knowledge, suggested by the commentary focused on simple description of the text, suggests that the making of this Sanskrit Sultanate space is as yet incomplete, yet in the end that incompleteness can perhaps be read as a metaphor for they way in which Jonarāja's project works in general. He can only speak in terms of ruptures and returns and is therefore unable to create a new sort of historical sensibility. In a way, he runs up against the same set of problems that stymied Kalhaṇa—how to create a historiography of the present. Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* must navigate the same conceptual difficulties of elite representation, patron-centered expectation, and the contingency of writing a history of the present. In his tale of ruptures, a patron- or elite-centered present can only be seen in terms of a redress of past wrongs and of balance between Brahmins and Muslims.

The works of Jonarāja stand at an important juncture for the creation of a Kashmiri identity and elite culture. They show an engagement with the past, both in his role as historian and in his role of literary exegete. Throughout his engagement with the past there is an implicit engagement with the present; throughout his reading of classical Sanskrit literature there is a commitment to Sanskrit intellectual culture in the Valley of Kashmir. His elite production is neither cosmopolitan, nor an encounter; rather he works to define a specific relationship with Sultanate power, religious difference, and regional understanding inflected by a deep reading of classical Sanskrit literature and a real engagement with historical change.

Francesca Orsini writes: "We need to remember that even texts in High languages were written by people who were still part of the vernacular world."[172] This is undoubtedly true, but the parameters and interests of this "vernacular world" have scarcely begun to be traced in Sultanate Kashmir. While comparative intellectual history of Sultanate's various rulers and regions has yet to be undertaken, Jonarāja's Sanskrit works provide a valuable voice in Orisini's vernacular world. Jonarāja's reading of the past, whether literary or historical, comments on his imagining of Sanskrit's place in Sultanate Kashmir.

---

[171] In this way, the Brahman/Muslim Suha Bhaṭṭa is arguably representative of a counter voice in this public debate).

[172] Francesca Orsini. "How to Do Multilingual History? Lessons from Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century North India." *IESHR* 49, 2 (2012): 243.

Chapter 6:[173] Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī*: The Rise and Fall of the Sultan-Centered *Rājataraṅgiṇī*

6.1 Introduction: Śrīvara, Kālhaṇa, and the Sultanate.

In the preceding chapters, I argued that the Kashmiri *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre develops ways to talk about power, politics, and the past in premodern Kashmir. In this chapter I introduce another historian, Śrīvara, in the trajectory of Kashmiri *rājataraṅgiṇī*-based histories. Both historians of the Kashmiri Sultanate, Jonarāja and Śrīvara, look to Kalhaṇa's text for a certain vocabulary and form to describe and chart the much-changed world of the fifteenth century. Yet while Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* remained unfinished and unshaped (and as such almost stands in metaphorically for the relationship between older Sanskrit forms and the new Sultanate reality on the ground), Jonarāja's student and successor Śrīvara creates a new articulation of history in the context of a patron-centered description of Zayn's rule in Kashmir. Śrīvara picks the narrative of Kashmiri history in 1459 and presents an innovative new reading of both the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre and contemporary history, which he titles the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, playing on the Sanskritization of Zayn's name.[174] The *Jainataraṅgiṇī* looks to the older twelfth-century form to provide the basic shape to a new articulation of a specifically Kashmiri sort of Sanskrit text.

This chapter outline the tensions between form and content, text and context, literary history and contemporary reality contained in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* and asks what such a provocatively positioned work can tell about the intellectual history of a transitional period in the Valley of Kashmir—and indeed the Indian Subcontinent as a whole. The *Jainataraṅgiṇī* "poeticizes" events in the life of Zayn ul-'Ābidīn (Sanskrit *Jainollabhadīna*), the Sultan of Kashmir from 1420 to 1470. Jonarāja's chronicle abruptly breaks off in 1459, the year of Jonarāja's sudden death,[175] yet Śrīvara attempts to give a synoptic picture of Zayn's life including events from all periods in his reign. Śrīvara's history is often non-chronological and supplements Jonarāja's work in surprising ways. In his introduction, Śrīvara takes pains to emphasize his own work's inferiority to that of his predecessor and, on reading these verses, one might expect that Śrīvara's own work would be a mere continuation of Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, supplementing and completing his *guru*'s own work.[176] Strikingly, quite the opposite is

---

[173] I presented some of the material in this chapter in a much changed form in "History at the End of History: Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī*." *IESHR*, 50,2 (2013): 221-236.

[174] There also seems to be the possibility of a pun here, with *jaina* deriving from *jina*, "the victorious one."

[175] *śrījonarājavibudhaḥ kurvan rājataraṅgiṇīm | sāyakāgnimite varṣe śivasāyujyam āsadat || Jainataraṅgiṇī* 1.1.6. "In the midst of writing the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the wise Jonarāja attained union with Śiva in the [Laukika] year [45]35 (1459 CE)." All translations, except where otherwise noted, are my own. Here and throughout, citations of Śrīvara's Sanskrit come from Walter Slaje's edition-in-progress of Śrīvara's histories. I would like to thank Prof. Slaje for making his work available to me and reading relevant passages with me in Halle, Germany in 2010-2011.

[176] In his 2001 article, "The Death of Sanskrit," Sheldon Pollock makes this argument, seeing Śrīvara's project as totally unoriginal chronicle, devoid of literary merit, "…in fact

true: Śrīvara uses the composition of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* as an opportunity to create something far different—and far more interesting—than a supplement or appendix to Jonarāja's history. From the very outset Śrīvara strikes a balance between presenting his work as a derivative, inferior work and highlighting the newness of his undertaking in form and content.

Reading the introduction to the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, it is clear that Śrīvara is aware of the new way in which he is handling a historical narrative. In praising Jonarāja's work, Śrīvara hints at his own project. He writes:

> *kenāpi hetunā tena proktaṃ madguruṇā na yat |*
> *taccheṣavartinīṃ vāṇīṃ kariṣyāmi yathāmati ||1.1.16||*

> To the best of my ability I will bring to voice of the remaining events
> which were for some reason not spoken by my teacher (=Jonarāja).[177]

Couched in a standard if not somewhat self-abasing rhetoric, Śrīvara here alludes to his innovations in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. It is clear from the passage quoted above that Śrīvara does not merely continue from where his predecessor stops, rather he attempts to fashion a new totality out of the life of Zayn, while still rooting this work to the traditions of a Kalhaṇa-based historiography. Here, Śrīvara steps away from completing the task left to him by Jonarāja, and in a way sets out to redo the entire life of Zayn. In this, the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* is a work of intense creativity, pushing the boundaries of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*-genre and the expressive power of Sanskrit as a political and literary language, inspired by and reacting to the vastly changed cultural landscape of fifteenth century Kashmir.

Before diving directly into the contents of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, the textual history of the work itself should be rehearsed. Here I use the term "*Jainataraṅgiṇī*" to designate

___

an even barer chronicle than that of his predecessor [=Jonarāja]," Pollock, "Death of Sanskrit," 397. He goes on to say that Śrīvara was "…unable to create serious literature…." *ibid*. He supports this argument by Śrīvara's words: "Expect no literary excellence here, the book is meant to memorialize him—let others write sweet poems… the style here is that of a mere clerk…. Other men, more learned, may someday use it to make beautiful verse." *ibid*. This quote conflates verses 1.8-1.9 in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* proper and verse 3.6 from the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* dealing with the reigns of Hasan and Mohammad Shāh. Even leaving aside that claims of modesty are found at the beginning of literary works from at least the time of Kālidāsa, The textual history of the work belies such a simple and literalistic reading. As I discuss later, Slaje has already shown these two introductory segments come from different works later brought together (see Slaje "On the Genesis of the So-Called *Jaina-Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī*," Walter Slaje "Geschichte *schreiben*" and below), and the portion in which Śrīvara compares himself to "a mere clerk" (Sanskrit *kāyasthoktivad eva*) comes from a later work, after the reign of Zayn. I think there may be two different ideas going on here, but speaking directly to the introduction to the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, a careful study of the entire actual contents show an intense engagement with Kalhaṇa's masterwork in a creative and new manner.
[177] *Jainataraṅgiṇī* 1.1.16.

specifically the first book in what has been called "Śrīvara's *Jainarājataraṅgiṇī*."[178] The text as transmitted in both the manuscript tradition and in modern editions and translations consists of four books, describing the reigns of Zayn, Ḥaydar Shāh, Ḥasan Shāh and Moḥammad Shāh, respectively. This understanding of the state of the text emphasizes a textual wholeness at the expense of internal evidence showing a development in the contents of Śrīvara's histories. In his 2004 article "On Śrīvara's So-Called *Jaina-Rājataraṅgiṇī*," Walter Slaje has convincingly shown that the portion of the text dealing with Sultan Zayn has been emended and broadened to include the reign of his son Hajji Khān (who reigned as Sultan Haydar Shāh). It seems that the first two books were combined by Śrīvara before writing books three and four.[179] At the beginning of book three, Śrīvara writes another introduction, thus showing that the later portions of the work dealing with Ḥasan Shāh and the first portion of the reign of Mohammad Shāh were originally conceived as a separate work, entitled the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. In the Kashmiri manuscript tradition, these works (the expanded *Jainataraṅgiṇī* and Śrīvara's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*) were transmitted together as one unit until finally in colonial times these two works were edited and published as one work. That Śrīvara's histories have been rewritten and reimagined by both Śrīvara and modern scholarship is fairly obvious from a close reading of the internal evidence contained in the text; I leave aside these post-Zayn histories now (which undoubtedly deserve more serious attention), but will return to them briefly in the conclusion of the chapter. This chapter will concentrate on the kernel of Śrīvara's history, the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* itself.

In editing the text in 1896, P. Peterson simply designates the text *Tṛtīyā Rājataraṅgiṇī*, "the Third *Rājataraṅgiṇī*."[180] The assumption such a label implies is a certain linear relationship with Kalhaṇa, a sort of static commitment to form and style. Such a title shows the extent to which expectations based on Kalhaṇa have colored the interpretation of Śrīvara's text. Certainly Śrīvara is very much within the lineage of Kalhaṇa, and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* serves as the main textual model for the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, yet Śrīvara does not slavishly continue Kalhaṇa's work (or for that matter those of his teacher Jonarāja). The changes in formal design and presentation shown in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* hint at larger changes in patronage structures and aesthetic expectation in fifteenth century Kashmir, and so the question becomes a matter of understanding in what way the pressures exerted by previous works and contemporary reality shape Śrīvara's work.

From the point of view of the relation of the poet to his subject, Śrīvara is in a much different position. Unlike Kalhaṇa and Jonarāja, Śrīvara has only the contemporary king to describe. Slaje writes, "Śrīvara's task was no longer the retrospective updating of

---

[178] Cf. Dhar, *Śrīvara's Zaina Rājataraṅginī*.

[179] The "seams" of this addition can be seen quite clearly in the introduction in verses such as 1.1.17, which suddenly mention the king's son while repeating ideas already contained in other verses. See Walter Slaje, "On the Genesis of the So-Called *Jaina-Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī*," *JOAS* 125, 1 (2005): 379-388. The verses in question are quoted and translated later in the chapter.

[180] The printed *editio princeps* is *The Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa, ed. by Durgāprasāda, Son of Vrajalāla, Vol. III: Containing the Supplements to the Work of Jonarāja, Śrīvara and Prājyabhāṭṭa*, ed. P. Peterson et al., 117 ff.

events. What had been historiography up to a point… saw now a change into contemporaneous biography…"[181] I agree with Slaje in identifying an important shift, yet how does such a shift come about within the aesthetic and historiographical expectations of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*-genre? More importantly, what does a "contemporaneous biography" actually look like? How does it reflect, describe, or interpret the aesthetic, social, and political circumstances in fifteenth century Kashmir?

To this end, rather than provide an in-depth survey of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* and its contents I try to understand Śrīvara's usage of the elastic *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre to accommodate a new vision of Sultanate Kashmir. I will look carefully at two aspects of the text. Firstly I look at the way in which Śrīvara allows "newness" to speak in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. To this end, I look particularly to its depiction of new technologies and ideas in Sanskritic forms. Secondly I examine the stresses put on the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre by its new more patron-centered Sultanate manifestation. In both of these discussions, the contours of a specifically Kashmiri and specifically Sultanate Sanskrit usage begin to come into focus. Śrīvara's history seeks to balance new ideas and older idioms in a new expressive Sultanate Sanskrit. I argue that Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī* seeks to complete Jonarāja's project of bringing Kashmiri Sanskrit into the Sultanate elite sphere.

6.2. Cannons, Sanskrit, and the Poetry of the New

Sometime in the year 1465 Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn displayed his newest acquisitions, bronze cannons, to the people of Kashmir. It must have been an occasion of great festivity in the Valley given its description in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. The Sultan was very interested in new technologies and took every opportunity to import new crafts and craftspeople into the Valley, especially from Central Asia. The cannon, or at least the explosives in it, was almost certainly engineered by a man simply named Ḥabīb, a former slave from Central Asia and recently settled in Kashmir.[182] The engineering of the bronze cannon was completed with the patronage, and even perhaps the actual physical help, of the Sultan. Gunpowder, fireworks, and pyrotechnics fascinated Sultan Zayn. We are told that during the theatrical performances of his reign, actresses and dancers held ignited roman-candle-like devices to delight the spectators.[183] Public spectacles seemed often to be accompanied by such pyrotechnic shows—indeed, the Sultan was so taken

---

[181] Slaje "On the Genesis of the So-Called *Jaina-Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī*," 382.

[182] Ḥabīb (Sanskrit Habebha) remains one of the most fascinating figures in Śrīvara's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. He was apparently a talented chemist and close to the Sultan, who admired his abilities in this area. Ḥabīb seemingly lived a blessed life, being one of the few confidants of Zayn's who (along with Śrīvara) survived the upheavals and purges of the Sultan's inner circle in the years after his death in 1470. See *ŚJT* 2.1.103-104.

> *yāsīt pituḥ sabhā yogyā tattatkāryaviśāradā |*
> *smṛtapūrvākāreṇa tena sarvāvasāditā ||2.1.103||*
> *antaraṅgān habebhādīn pañcaśān adhilādaraiḥ |*
> *arakṣat prāktanaṃ smṛtvā prema sevāṃ ca paitṛkīm ||2.1.104||*
> *English Translation?*

[183] See *ŚJT*, verses 1.4.19-29.

with the subject that he even composed a treatise on gunpowder and its uses in Persian verse, a work now sadly lost.[184]

We know of this display, and of the Sultan's efforts in the field of firearms and pyrotechnics through Śrīvara's description of the installation of the cannons in the first chapter of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. He compiled his *praśasti*, or praise poem, in the fashion of a royal panegyrist with a series of verses in ornate meters characterized by the usage of many figures of speech, Śrīvara's cannon eulogy provides a glimpse into the duties of a Sanskrit-speaking *paṇḍita* in the court of the Sultan of Kashmir. In many ways, this *praśasti* could have been written for any South Asian king of any religious background, yet the fact that Śrīvara writes in difficult classical Sanskrit in a milieu that would normally be studied from the point of view of Persian sources forces the modern reader to question the categories through which scholars should approach the court of Zayn. In Śrīvara, the Persianate world of the fifteenth century is described in terms and metaphors drawn from the literary tradition of Sanskritic South Asia, subverting the usual subject/source language divide that characterizes the study of the history of the Subcontinent. To look at one striking instance of how Śrīvara harnesses the Sanskrit language to describe the contemporary political life of Sultanate Kashmir, the Cannon Eulogy will be quoted in its entirety. Śrīvara introduces his *prasasti* thus:

> *tad yantrabhāṇḍabhedāṃś ca tattaddhātumayān navān |*
> *ānītavān narapatiḥ saṃhatāñ śilpinirmitān || 1.1.73 ||*
> *praśastiḥ kriyatāṃ yantrabhāṇḍeṣv iti nṛpājñayā |*
> *mayaiva racitāñ ślokān prasaṅgāt kathayāmy aham || 1.1.74 ||*

The Lord of Men moreover obtained an assortment of modern, solid metal alloy cannons,[185] cast by craftsmen. Commissioned by the Sultan to write a eulogy for the cannons, I composed [these] stanzas. As the occasion presents itself, I quote [here as follows]:

Before continuing on to the actual contents of the eulogy I would just like to point out that two important facts about Śrīvara, the Sultan, and Sanskrit are hinted at here: first, that the importance of the event required a public poem in Sanskrit commemorating the occasion. Second, that the Sultan patronised this event. In Śrīvara's setting up of the event, Sanskrit is still a language for public expression of political power. The eulogy begins:

> *yadanugraheṇa rājñāṃ samayo līlāvilāsamayaḥ|*

---

[184]   *śikṣayitvāhabebhākhyaṃ tās tāh sarvāḥ pradarśitāḥ |*
          kṣāras tadupayogyo 'tra durlabhaḥ kṛtaḥ ||1.5.27||
          praśnottaramayasvoktīr habebhaṃ prati yāḥ kṛtāḥ |
          pārasībhāṣayā kāvyaṃ dṛṣṭvādya kurute na kaḥ ||1.5.28||

[185] The translation of these verses merit some annotation, since Śrīvara is writing about topics that are not well represented in the studied corpus of Sanskrit literature. Here, the Sanskrit word is *yantra-bhāṇḍa*, literally "device-pot." I translate *tattaddhātumaya* as "metal alloy", although literally it means "made of various metals."

samayaś ca yantratantraiḥ sthirāṃ pratiṣṭhāṃ kriyāt sa mayaḥ || 1.1.75 ||
rasavasuśikhicandrāṅke śāke nākeśaviśruto rājā |
śrījainollābhadīnaḥ kaśmīrān pālayan vijayī || 1.1.76 ||
varṣe śaśivedāṅke nirmitavān yantrabhāṇḍam idam |
tad iti mausulabhāṣākhyātaṃ loke tadṛkāṇḍam iti || 1.1.77 ||
durgeṣu durgatiparaṃ hṛtsphoṭakaraṃ turaṅgadattadaram |
dūronmuktāśmaśaraṃ kaṭakabalātyadṛṣṭacaram || 1.1.78 ||
sāraṃ surītibaddhaṃ ghanaghoṣaṃ śilpikalpitamahāryam |
navam iva nagaraṃ nṛpateḥ kalpaṃ stād yantrabhāṇḍam idam || 1.1.79 ||
dhātuvibhaktisphārāt padapravṛttyā prayojite śabde |
arthopalabdhihetur bhavatv idaṃ vṛddhiguṇayuktyā' || 1.1.80 ||
iti padyāṅkitā yantrabhāṇḍālī vyarucan navā |
yad aśmotthadhvaniś cakre meghagarjanatarjanām || 81||[186]

"Would that he, [another] Maya, by whose favor rulers pass their time (*samaya*) in playful ways (*līlāvilāsamayaḥ*) and an agreement (*samaya*) with rulers is child's play (*līlāvilāsamayaḥ*), consolidates [his] superiority with [the help of these] cannon formations. In 1464,[187] the glorious Sulṭān Zayn al-'Ābidīn, famed as Indra, triumphed in protecting the people of Kashmīr. In 1465,[188] he had such a cannon made [in Kashmīr]. In the language of the Muslims it is called '*dūd*',[189] [local] people call it '*dūd-kāṇḍa*. It brought down disaster on strongholds by releasing stone cannonballs from afar, [which] flew entirely invisibly for the enemy forces, making [their] hearts tremble [and their] horses stampede. Solid, sheathed in high-quality bell-metal, roaring like thunderclouds, [and] a product of craftsmen that cannot be stolen: may this cannon last an eon! [May it last an eon] like an exceptional town newly [founded] by the Sulṭān, in the shape of beautiful rows [of houses], noisy because of [its] crowds, an impregnable construction of craftsmanship! When its rumbling has been triggered off because of the explosion of the [combustible] components by an impetus [given] by the foot through use

---

[186] I here quote from Walter Slaje's provisional edition of the *ŚRT*. I would like to thank Professor Slaje for making this available to me and for reading many relevant passages with me during my DAAD fellowship in Halle, 2011-2012.

[187] Lit. "In the Śāka year 1386".

[188] Lit. "In the [Laukika-]year [45]41".

[189] Professor Slaje notes in his comments to the passage: "All manuscripts read *tad*, which is supposedly a phonetic representation (tŏd) of a Persian or Turkish word for cannon. The one closest in meaning and pronunciation would be Persian *dūd* (pronounced dŏd and meaning "smoke"), as Kashmiri pronunciation does not sharply differentiate between voiced and surd consonants. *Dūd kardan* means "to produce smoke" (Steingass: p. 541), which would account for naming a cannon after its characteristic. I am grateful to Dr. Heike Franke for referring me to this. Kaul (Ed.) has emended his text against all manuscript evidence in accordance with the Turkish word for cannon (*top*)."

of a long fuse: may it [then] become the cause for obtaining riches! [And]
may this [eulogy of mine, too,] become a cause for obtaining riches after
its sounds were produced as a result of a [sudden] disclosure [of the
meaning] of verbal roots and case terminations through usage of inflected
words connected with vowel gradation." The new line of [his] cannons, so
marked by meter, shone brightly when the boom of [their] heat flashes
was threatening [like] the rumbling of thunderclouds.

This description of the cannons is somewhat awkwardly inserted into the first chapter of
Śrīvara's account of the life of Sultan Zayn, the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. The mention of the
cannons and Śrīvara's *praśasti* is largely self-contained, placed between an account of
Zayn exiling his son Adham Khān and his return to battle with his brother, Zayn's second
son, Hajji Khān. Noting the problematic position of the verses within the text of the
Jainataraṅgiṇī[190] and the difficult readings of the text itself[191] the very composition of
these verses is difficult and, at times, strange. The cannon *praśasti* attempts to move in
both the world of traditional Sanskrit *kāvya* and its conventions and expectations and the
world of the fifteenth-century Sultanate, where new materials, inventions, and ideas are
circulating that were completely unknown in the purview of the Sanskrit language. I
argue that Śrīvara pushes the Sanskrit language to its limit. In this way, these verses
serve as a sort of synecdoche for the unique place in which Śrīvara and his work were
situated in the court of Zayn al-'Ābidīn.

   To return to the cannon eulogy itself, it can be easily be mined for historical
details; Śrīvara gives dates and outlines the history of the importation of firearm
technology into the Valley. Yet the form and the framing of this material shows that it is
much more than a chronicle listing dates and events. The work attempts a sort of
encyclopedic inclusivism. Śrīvara's interest in contemporary languages, shown even in a
eulogistic hymn, shows an intense curiosity about the various languages spoken; after
introducing his own Sanskrit neologism for the word cannon, he includes other
contemporary terms, those used in Persian (here, "the language of the Muslims,"
mausulabhāṣā and those used in Kashmiri (here, "in the world" *loke*, he later also uses
the term *deśī*). Here and throughout his work, he tends to divide his contemporary
linguistic landscape into the same three: Sanskrit, Persian and Kashmiri. In verse 77 for
instance, *tat-kāṇḍa* of the edited text seems to be a Persian-Sanskrit loanword formation
of '*dūd-kāṇḍa*' which presumably represents a vernacular neologism coined for the

---

[190] Construing the verse in the larger flow of the first chapter is made all the more
difficult by the ungainly connective *ca* "and" in verse 78 [unquoted]. The exact elements
being correlated are unclear. The manuscripts unanimously transmit this order, so if
there is some textual corruption, it must have occurred early in the history of the
Jainataraṅgiṇī's transmission.
[191] When quoting from Śrīvara's historical text, I have retained the critical apparatus of
Walter Slaje's edition-in-progress, while adding further readings and notes. Here I would
like to thank Professor Slaje for reading some crucial portions of Śrīvara's histories with
me. I would also like to acknowledge the help of the Seminar für Indologie, at the
Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittemburg, in making scans of many manuscripts of
Śrīvara's works during my time in Halle 2010-2011.

newly introduced technology. In the given context, *dūd* comes from the Persian meaning smoke, and *kāṇḍa* most likely means "cane, reed, staff." Compounded, it would have conveyed a meaning like "smoke-cane," and in all likelihood reflects what people probably called a gun barrel. New technology requires new words, and Śrīvara delighted in recording them all.

From the point of view of material culture, these verses provide a striking glance into the material culture of the late fifteenth-century Sultanate. Śrīvara gives details concerning what the devices were made of, how they functioned, and how they were actually used. Despite of, or in addition to these verses' documentary value, the *yantrabhāṇḍa-praśasti* points to a process much more important for the understanding of second-millennium Sanskrit in the quickly changing world of the Kashmiri Sultanate. I read this verse as an attempt to bring the contemporary into the classical in a way rarely seen in premodern Sanskrit discourse.

These verses show a wrestling with the possibilities and limitations of the Sanskrit language, a language embedded in more than a thousand years of courtly tradition and cultivated usage. Here, the formal characteristics of courtly language are on display: ornate *kāvya* meters (in this passage he uses the *upagīti* and *āryā*), the use of difficult or rare verbal forms (for instance the archaicizing future imperative in the sense of the benedictive of √*as*, *stāt*, "may it be!" used in verse 79[192]), and the use of ornate figures of speech, especially the figure of speech know as *śleṣa*, meaning paranomasia or pun. Such forms are to be expected within the genre of royal panegyric—indeed, one could argue that this is exactly what would be expected—yet, embedded in the expected is the surprising; these verses also attempt to say something new, to look outside of the sealed world of Sanskritic tropes and themes. The attempt to celebrate the new in terms of the old brings an energy—and an awkwardness—to the poetry of Śrīvara. This can perhaps be seen most clearly in the use of one of Śrīvara's favorite figures of speech, *śleṣa*.[193]

Śleṣa has often been used in this sort of public poetry, and it is not surprising to find such verses in such a context. In the seven verses that make up the quoted *praśasti*, two are *śleṣa* verses, which is to be expected in any display of ingenuity in courtly poetry. Yet even with such expectations, verse 80 is striking. The verse is a *śleṣa* verse, yet the

---

[192] See Whitney (1924) §§ 570 f.

[193] In the translation I have underlined the *aprastūta*, or non-contextual punned meaning which I have translated after the *prastūta*, or contextual, primary meaning of the verse. The importance of *śleṣa* for elite political production has only recently begun to be studied. In my understanding of *śleṣa* as marking a particularly elite and political register, I follow the works of Yigal Bronner and Sylvan Broquet. Bronner has traced the history of *śleṣa*'s growing importance to Sanskrit elite culture in his 2010 monograph *Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement of Simultaneous Narration* (New York: Columbia University Press). Broquet has studied the use of *śleṣa* in Pāla-era political poetry in Bengal in his study of the *Rāmacarita* in his *La Geste de Rāma: Poème à double sens de Sandhyākaranandin (Introduction, texte, traduction, analyse)* (Pondicherry: Institut Françaid de Pondichéry, 2010). Śrīvara here draws upon a tradition of *śleṣa*-based political poetry while attempting to include new technologies under its rubric. I discuss the way his *śleṣa* is a surprising departure from the traditional *śleṣa*-based *praśasti*-s below.

actual paranomasia is difficult, and not immediately clear. Reading the verse in a straight forward manner one would without much difficulty understand: "May this [*praśasti*] become a cause for obtaining riches once its sounds are produced as a result of the disclosure [of the meaning] of verbal roots and case terminations by means of inflected words connected with vowel gradation." Such a verse certainly has a place within the context of the poem, yet the subject should be the cannon, not the activity of the poet. Upon rereading, the verse, hesitatingly and with much effort on the part of the reader, gives up another meaning, one connected to the cannon: "When its rumbling has been triggered off because of the explosion of the [combustible] components by an impetus [given] by the foot through skillful use of a long fuse: may it [then] become the cause for obtaining riches!"

When fully translated, this meaning seems plausible, if not intended, yet the actual construing of the text becomes problematic: can *dhātuvibhaktisphārāt* really mean "because of the explosion of the [combustible] components"?[194] Can we really take *vṛddhiguṇayuktyā* as "through use of a long fuse"? What would that actually mean in real terms? Leaving aside the modern reader's difficulty in understanding the actual mechanics of the cannons of the fifteenth century, there is a very real strangeness to the Sanskrit here. New terms are being coined for new objects, one cannot simply turn to old dictionaries or to the canons of praise poetry that have been valorized by the literary tradition itself. With this verse I think we come to the heart of placing Śrīvara and his endeavors in the intelletual history of Kashmir. He tried to live simultaneously in the world defined by the Kashmiri Sanskrit literary tradition and in the world of the fifteenth-century Sultanate court. This positioning forced him to find a language which works in both worlds. In this way, an understanding of the mechanics of his *śleṣa* might help illuminate the mechanics of his literary undertaking.

How are we to understand Śrīvara's *śleṣa*? For the most part, theoreticians of poetry held that three meanings are present in *śleṣa*: the two different meanings indicated by the *śleṣa* itself and the meaning of the relationship between them. According to the theory of *śleṣa*, in a bitextual verse, there are two meanings (*artha*-s), the contextual (*prastutārtha*) and the non-contextual (*aprastutārtha*). For the Kashmiri aesthetic theoreticians like Rudraṭa, one meaning leads to another that in turn leads to a grasping of the relationship between them. The Kashmiri theoreticians after Ānandavardhana who accept *dhvani*, or poetic suggestion, see this relationship as the suggested sense, the highest purpose in poetry.

To return to the two direct meanings in this verse, the non-contextual most clearly present; any educated reader of Sanskrit would immediately recognize the terms for verbal roots, grammatical case, and vowel ablaut. It is only when we reach the contextual, the *prastutārtha*, that the reader encounters difficulty, must invent a new language out of the fragments of classical Sanskrit. The meanings of the various words for the mechanics of firearms must be inferred from context; in fact, this is an inversion of the way it should be according to prescriptive theoretical texts.

Here we come to the heart of the matter, both from the position of a medieval Kashmiri theoretician of aesthetics and from the position of a modern literary historian.

---

[194] Lit.: "the explosion (*sphāra*) of the separation (*vibhakti*) of the ingredients/chemicals (*dhātu*)."

What can we extrapolate as suggested here? In Śrīvara's verse, the meaning can be arrived at, as we have seen, with some difficulty. Yet how actually to conceptualize the connection between the two meanings; between the world of fifteenth-century *realia*—the sultan, cannons, gunpowder, and the well-trodden world of Sanskrit grammar, philosophy, and royal panegyric?

If we may expand the technical discussion into a larger metaphor for Śrīvara, his literary production, and his context we can perhaps see a relation between the textual meaning as intelligible in terms of the Sanskritic literary production and the textual meaning as intelligible in terms of the fifteenth-century Kashmiri Sultanate. In interpreting these verses, one sees both a problematic and a possibility; to understand the actual language of Śrīvara, the reader must move beyond the well-worn tropes of the Hindu and the Muslim. One must also reconsider notions of the courtly and the cosmopolitan which have recently become inseparable from discussions of Sanskrit literary culture and instead speak of regionally and temporally bound modes of expression. The positioning is further complicated by the genealogies and lineages in which Śrīvara situates his texts: as "historical" works of a certain sort they exist outside of (or at least uncomfortably alongside) the genre of courtly expression *par excellence*, that is *kāvya*. In Śrīvara, one senses a fluidity of style, genre, and expectation that defies easy categorization. In that way, a reading of Śrīvara demands a certain poetics of newness, a certain methodology of reading that not only highlights the textual continuities Śrīvara wishes to highlight—particularly with specifically Kashmīri Sanskrit genres and tropes—but also recognizes the fault lines, the sites of rupture, and the points of departure regarding the vastly changed world.

6.3 Structure, Chronology, and Historicity in Śrīvara's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.

From the way in which Śrīvara brings new topics into the Sanskrit language, I turn to Śrīvara's creation of a new form demanded by the *rājataraṅgiṇī*'s place in the Sultanate court of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn. To a historian, reading the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* can be a frustrating or disconcerting experience. The order of the events often belies the expectations of historical narrative, or indeed those of a Kalhaṇa-style historical poem. When one reads the poem more closely, the problems in chronology become especially difficult to conceptualize. How can this poem be called a history, or even qualified by the adjective "historical," when dates and events are so jumbled together? The most obvious solution is to insist that the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* is first and foremost a poetic work, and that calling it history is an unfair imposition of a specific set of expectations upon a text that had a much different goal. One could argue, in my opinion correctly, that concerns of *rasa* or aestheticized emotional response are paramount to the construction and imagination of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and its successors.[195] Yet, the problem remains that no matter which aesthetic theory is applied, Śrīvara does have a documentary goal in writing the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. He states this in his introduction, writing: "[…] the intention of [my] present effort is to call to memory the events relating to the king [, Sultan Zayn ul-ʿĀbidīn]."[196] Such a verse calls to mind one of the ancient functions of a poet in

---

[195] See for instance Slaje, "In the Guise of Poetry."
[196] *atha vā nṛpavṛttāntasmṛtihetur ayaṃ śramaḥ | ŚJR* 1.1.10ab. The *atha vā*, which I

classical Sanskrit culture, to make a "body of fame" for the king and patron.[197] Set against Śrīvara's stated goal is that the numbing violence and vanity of political life will cause readers to turn away from the world (an idea very much present in Kalhaṇa, but adapted and expanded by Śrīvara). Caught between the pull towards Kalhaṇa-influenced historical representation and towards court biography as royal panegyric, Śrīvara creates an ordered world unlike anything written previously in Sanskrit.

Regarding the "temporal confusion" of the sequence of events depicted in Śrīvara, the solution to the problem of chronology is of course simple: the large-scale trajectory of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* moves forward in time—that is, it begins with Zayn's triumph at the battle of Mallaśīla in 1452 (interestingly 6 years before Śrīvara starts his tenure as the author of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*) and ends with his death in 1470 and the ascension of his son Hājji Khān to the throne—but when describing the life of Zayn, Śrīvara tends to move thematically not chronologically. It seems that each of the seven chapters is organized around a different type of event that takes center stage.

An obvious example of this is Chapter Seven, which depicts the death of Zayn in 1470. The chapter begins with a rather beautiful and evocative vignette of a tightrope walker who had arrived from outside the Valley to perform for the king. During the show, the spectators and *nāga*-s become upset, but above the tumult below, the tightrope walker hovers, suspended against the background of the sky. The first eight verses follow:

> *dātā bhavet kṣitipatir yadi sādaro 'yaṃ*
> *loko 'pi darśayati tat svakalākalāpam |*
> *varṣāsu varṣati ghano yadi cātako 'pi*
> *nṛtyan mudā bhavati tajjanarañjanāya || 1 ||*
> *athottarapathād dānakhyātakīrter mahīpateḥ |*
> *rajjubhramaṇaśilpajñaḥ ko 'py āgāt yavano 'ntikam || 2 ||*
> *viṃśaprasthābhidhe sthāne kadācid yavanotsavam |*
> *taṃ draṣṭum agamad rājā parivāravibhūṣitaḥ || 3 ||*
> *dhanurdaṇḍaśatāyāmāntarasthān dīrgharajjubhiḥ |*
> * uccān stambhān abadhnāt sa svaśilpaprathanodyataḥ || 4 ||*
> *abhavan kaluṣās te ye nāgā rajjupurādiṣu |*
> *bhāvisvabhaktabhūpāladehāniṣṭekṣaṇād iva || 5 ||*
> *atho bhūbhāgalagnaikarajjumārgeṇa nirbhayaḥ |*
> *āroham akarot tatra patatrīva nabho'ntare || 6 ||*
> *nipātāskhalitāṃ tatra lokacittānurañjikām |*

have left untranslated for purposes of clarity, contrasts the documentary purpose of the work with that of the poetic. However, this should not be read as Pollock does as a preclusion of poetic or aesthetic purposes in the poem. See Pollock "The Death of Sanskrit" especially p. 397 and note 4.

[197] The notion of a "body of fame" is fairly common in Sanskrit poetry and poetics. For an early example of this concept in *alaṃkāraśāstra*, see Daṇḍin *Kāvyādarśa* 1.5. For some examples written by Kashmiri authors, see McCrea, "Poetry Beyond Good and Evil" on the *Vikramāṅkitadevacarita* of Bilhaṇa and Kalhaṇa 1.3. I would like to thank W. Cox for bringing these to my attention.

kaviteva sa śilpejyaś citrāṃ padagatiṃ vyadhāt || 7 ||
anīcavartinas tasya grahasyeva phalapradā |
suraśmirāśigasyālaṃ babhūvāścaryabhūr nṛṇām || 8 ||

If a king is generous, the devoted people too show the whole variety of
their own skills: when the cloud pours rain in the rainy season, then the
joyfully dancing *cātaka* bird too begins to dance with joy in order to
delight his people. Once (*atha*) a certain Muslim (*yavana*), expert in the
art of tightrope-walking, came from the North to the Sulṭān, who was
famous for his generosity. On one occasion (*kadācid*), the Sulṭān, adorned
by his retinue, went to a Muslim festival (*yavanotsava*) at the place called
Viṃśaprastha to see him. Ready to display his own skill, he connected
high posts, which were at a distance of one hundred bow-lengths apart,
with long ropes. The Nāgas from Rajjupura and elsewhere became
agitated (*kaluṣa*), apparently because they anticipated some sort of bodily
harm to the Sulṭān, who was their own future devotee (*bhāvisvabhakta-*).
Then, fearless like a bird up in the sky, [the tightrope walker] swung
himself up with a single rope fixed to the ground. There, this true master
of his art performed extraordinary steps without any mistakes which could
have [caused him to] fall, captivating the attention of the people. [In so
doing] he was like a poet stringing words together, in which [the position
of] the particles was faultless.[198] As he walked high above, like a planet
moving through the constellations in all their splendor, the place of this
wonderful performance rewarded all those men [watching].[199]

Note the ambiguous temporal markers in this passage. Śrīvara's account of the tightrope
walker contains only two particles which serve to mark the time in the trajectory of the
larger narrative: *atha*, which I have translated as "once," can mean "then" or "now" or "at
that time" or simply show a shift of topic and *kadācana*, an indefinite temporal marker,
meaning simply "on one occasion," or "sometime." (The second *atha* is used to mark
time within the vignette itself, not within the larger narrative in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*.) This
vignette is completely set aside from any sort of historical flow; it is bracketed and placed
at the beginning of the account of the final days of Zayn to provide an organizing
metaphor for the chapter. Note the interesting specification of place—Viṃśaprastha and
Rajjupura. He is carefully describing an event outside of the constraints of temporal
narrative structure, maintaining its "realism" while allowing it to connect with narrative
structure outside the concerns of "history."[200]

It is perhaps useful to dwell for a moment on the organization of this brief
selection. Śrīvara's chapters tend to begin (and sometimes end) with gnomic verses. In

---

[198] This verse is a *śleṣa*, a punning verse in which each word has two distinct senses. For
instance *pāda* means both "word" and "step" while *nipāta* means both "mistake" and
"grammatical particle." I have translated the verse twice, giving each sense.
[199] ŚRT 1.7.1-8.
[200] For discussions of the terms "history" and "realism," see Y. Bronner and W. Cox in
this collection.

verse one, the happiness and welfare of the populace is tied to the nature of the king, just as much as the happiness of the *cātaka* bird is tied to the monsoon rains. The vignette itself is packed with intriguing detail: how this Muslim entertainer came to the valley, how he set up his equipment, and how he actually performed for the Sultan. The element of danger is highlighted, and strangely, the threat to the performer is transferred as a threat to Zayn himself. The Nāgas themselves, the autochthonic guardian spirits of all watery places in the Valley, become agitated.[201] This sense of unease permeates the account with only the tightrope walker seemingly immune to the agitation on the ground beneath his feet. Significantly, the final two verses compare the tightrope walker first punningly to a poet and second to a planet amidst the stars of the Zodiac, a human embodiment of Fate. Here I think this evocative image hints at Śrīvara's larger project; the turmoil in the world below can be perceived and organized by only the skilled poet and Fate, two concerns that are central to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s self-imagination. The key elements of danger to the king, poetry, and Fate—the thematic focus of the Seventh chapter—are evocatively portrayed in a simple story, outside of time, yet in the right place.

The vignette of the tightrope walker, so poetically potent, is followed by an account of a comet, a universal harbinger of doom, hovering above the city. Walter Slaje has convincingly demonstrated that this is an apparition of Halley's comet in the summer of 1456, which made its appearance in the valley a full 14 years before the death of Zayn in 1470.[202] The description of the comet, colored by images of eclipses, weeping dogs, and the calls of owls is followed by brief accounts of famine, war, and conflagration.[203] The dates of these events are uncertain; indeed, Śrīvara makes no effort to set these

---

[201] In connection with the Nāgas, one should note the obscure compound *bhāvisvabhakta-*. I have translated it as "who was their own future devotee," but its interpretation is still open to question. Whitney Cox has suggested to me that perhaps this alludes to the fact that soon Zayn will die, and as a Muslim will be buried. He will then come into their domain as the autochthonic guardian spirits of the Valley. While such an interpretation would fit well in the context of Zayn's last days, the exact meaning of this phrase remains obscure to me.

[202] See Walter Slaje, "*Inter Alia, Realia*: An Apparition of Halley's Comet in Kashmir Observed by Śrīvara in AD 1456," in *Highland Philology: Results of a Text-Related Kashmir Panel at the 31st DOT, Marburg, 2010*, ed. Roland Steiner (Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittemburg: 2010).

[203] Here Śrīvara includes several fascinating, if rather vague accounts of political upheaval in Central and South Asia. First he mentions the downfall of Sultan Mīrza Abu Sayyid, ruler of Khurasān (mentioned as an ally of Zayn in 1.6.22-24). Dhar argues in the notes to his translation that the famine here spoken of occurred in Central Asia in 1469, and the war mentioned was fought with Turkman Hassan Beg (who Śrīvara calls the ruler of Iraq). Later in 1.7.49-51, Śrīvara mentions the death of Zayn's friend and ally Qiyam ud-Dīn, the Ruler of Sind, at the hands of a certain Ibrahim. These events are interspersed with notices of deaths of various officials and queens. Interestingly enough, the account of the burning of Suyyapura (1.7.34-44) focuses of the loss of the archives kept there. The town is rebuilt but the records, excepting the copper-plate land grants, are lost.

events within a temporal sequence, rather these events serve to establish a certain feeling or mood which will dominate the chapter. Chapter Seven tells of the death of Zayn; this central event and its emotional content is framed by these brief evocations of a word in turmoil, incipient chaos, and things ending.

Such a thematicization, and its progression, can perhaps be understood in terms of *rasa*, or the work's emotion effects in the reader. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa identifies *śānta*, the aesthetic sentiment of equanimity, as its main "goal." Kalhaṇa writes:

> *kṣaṇabhaṅgini jantūnām sphurite paricintite |*
> *mūrdhābhiṣekaḥ śāntasya rasasyātra vicāryatām || RT 1.23||*

> Recalling the sudden experience of living beings as lasting for a moment only, [the reader] is invited to examine in this [work of mine the poetical] coronation of the calm sentiment (*śānta rasa*).[204]

Kalhaṇa is using very specific terminology from the philosophy of aesthetics, and specifically from the Kashmiri understanding of the classification of aesthetic experience. Kalhaṇa's clear linking of his work with certain canons of textual interpretation have led some scholars to conclude that his work should be read through the expectations of those canons. In this way the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, for all of its quirks, anomalies, and innovations, can be seen as a *kāvya* (specifically a *mahākāvya*) and can be interpreted accordingly. Although this is not the occasion to fully critique such a view, I here argue for a less deterministic interpretation of the idea of *rasa*—and *śānta rasa* in particular—when reading the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa and the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* of Śrīvara.

It must be stressed that this is not to say that *rasa* did not play any role in imagining the structure of the *rājataraṅgiṇī* texts. On the contrary, *rasa* was central: it gave a shape to the underlying moral imagination of the work. That is, it speaks to the way in which the subject matter, the events depicted by the poem, are understood, arranged, translated, and transformed. For Kalhaṇa, an appeal to *rasa* and a deployment of *rasa*-based terminology do not firmly set the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* into the carefully theorised world of aesthetic typologies, but rather show the new sort of space being opened by such historical texts. That is, *rasa* does not show how the text is to be read as a *mahākāvya*, rather *rasa*-terminology provides a vocabulary for the structuring of the moral undertones of the work. Kalhaṇa's views on life and death, the passage of time and the fickle nature of kings and fate are encoded in this technical vocabulary. Śrīvara is heir to this moral and aesthetic conception and expands it with reference to other textual sources.

At the beginning of his *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, Śrīvara makes a statement similar to that of Kalhaṇa, although he does not use the expected word *śānta*:

> *svadṛgdṛṣṭamṛtānekavipadvibhavasaṃsmṛteḥ |*
> *sūte kasya na vairāgyaṃ nāma Jainataraṅgiṇī ||*

---

[204] Trans. W. Slaje. For an in depth discussion of *śānta rasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī,* see Lawrence McCrea's article "*Śāntarasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*."

Who in this world does not recall the power of the many misfortunes, appearing before his very eyes and just as swiftly passing away? For whom does the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* not produce disillusionment (*vairāgya*)?[205]

Śrīvara relies on a related term *vairāgya* or "disillusionment" or "dispassion." This specific concept becomes central for Śrīvara, displacing Kalhaṇa's *śānta*. This shift in terminology is important, since *rasa* words are almost universally recognizable in premodern Sanskrit literary discourse. So why does Śrīvara shift this key term? Here I argue that this slight change can help unpack the mechanics of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*'s complex relationship with the poetics of the present and the inherited Kalhaṇa-based historiography. The word *vairāgya* both links to *rasa*-based aesthetic conceptions utilized by authors like Kalhaṇa and at the same time looks to other texts, specifically the *Mokṣopāya*, to give shape to Śrīvara's imagination of the life of Zayn.

To begin with *vairāgya* and its aesthetic connotations, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* connects the word *vairāgya* to *śānta*: "Now *śānta*, being a state of dispassion, produces spiritual liberation. It arises through the emotional conditions like knowing the true nature of things (*tattvajñāna*), disillusionment (*vairāgya*), and purification of the mind's dispositions (*āśayaśuddhi*)."[206] This definition seems to accord very well with Śrīvara's historiographical project, yet it is perhaps odd that Śrīvara does not use the name of the *rasa* to link all of these elements. Here, I think the use of the word *vairāgya* nods toward *śānta* and *rasa* theory, but denies a programmatic application of these ideas to the text. This leads one towards the other possible valences of the term *vairāgya* and its application to Kashmiri historiography and literary interpretation.

I have the suspicion that Śrīvara uses the term *vairāgya* because of its deep relationship with an important and under-read Kashmiri text, the *Mokṣopāya* (*The Means to Liberation*)—a text that is itself intimately tied to kingship and, as we will see, is referred to at key moments in the narrative. Although the exact relationship between the *Mokṣopāya*, its technical terminology and Śrīvara's text cannot be explored in any detail here, it seems to me that Śrīvara's use of the word *vairāgya*, with its clear aesthetic resonances, is intended to "stand in" for *śānta* while adding the salvific and religious valences given to *vairāgya* by the *Mokṣopāya*.[207] Here, I hope that the provisional hypothesis that Śrīvara somehow broadens the scope of *rasa* to include such terms will suffice to at least show a possible way of understanding the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*'s marked shift

---

[205] *ŚJT* 1.1.18. Trans. W. Cox. I would like to thank Dr. Cox for his helpful comments on interpreting this verse.
[206] *atha śānto nāma śamasthāyibhāvātmako mokṣapravartakaḥ. sa tu tattvajñāna-vairāgyāśayaśuddhyādibhir vibhāvaiḥ samutpadyate.* Bharata, *Natyaśāstra of Bharatamuni* (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1987): 328.
[207] For helpful discussions of *vairāgya* in the *Mokṣopāya*, see Walter Slaje, "Liberation from Intentionality and Involvement: On the Concept of *Jīvanmukti* According to the Mokṣopāya. *JIP* (2000): 28 and Stinner's "Praefatio" to the edition of the *Vairāgyaprakāraṇa* of the *Mokṣopāya*.

in terminology.[208]

       These related aesthetic concepts, *śānta* and *vairāgya*, shape the narrative of both Śrīvara and Kalhaṇa, and are highlighted through an emphasis on mutability and transience in their works. The realization that nothing remains fixed is a central purpose to the aesthetic and moral imagination of the works of both poets. The mutability of things is built into the organizing metaphor of Kalhaṇa's entire enterprise, that of the wave, or *taraṅga*. Like the waves, the narratives in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* rise and fall, crest and crash. In Kalhaṇa's model nothing is stable; the promise and potentiality shown by kings is always unfulfilled, their reigns end in disappointment or violence, and always in death. Throughout Kalhaṇa's work this cycle is repeated again and again, and always the power of fate confounds the reader's expectation and shows that in the long run kings become corrupted or overthrown and happiness is impermanent. This is Kalhaṇa's *śānta*, the world-weary equanimity brought about by an emotional distance from the events of the text, which are as violent, constant, and unstoppable as waves on the sea.

       Such a perspective is impossible in Śrīvara's text. The context in which Śrīvara writes makes such emotional distance, even if it were temporally possible, undesirable. Slaje is correct when he points out that the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* moves into the zone of "biography;" the whole existence of the work is bound to one historical personage. The change of emphasis forces changes in the structure and texture of the work, yet Śrīvara must remain somehow true to the expectations of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as a model text. This can be seen by looking at the way in which time is dealt with in the two different histories. The scope of the events covered precludes a long view of historical processes; in its totality the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* covers only twenty-four years; Kalhaṇa's purports to cover thousands (and Jonarāja's around three hundred). These differences give rise to a very real difference in tone and imagination in Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, yet since the work is an heir to the organizational universe of Kalhaṇa; the same categories are used but adapted to a different context. Śrīvara's entire *Jainataraṅgiṇī* is one *taraṅga*, one wave. The work particularizes the generalized historical processes of rising and falling to one career: the rise and inevitable fall (through the power of fate as death) of Sultan Zayn ul-'Ābidīn. Since this work only focuses on one ruler, and this ruler was the patron of the author, the depiction of the ruler must be controlled within the expectations of the *Rāgataraṅgiṇī* genre. These genre expectations (especially the deployment of *vairāgya/sānta*-centered organizational strategies) must be modified or diffused to conform to certain norms of royal representation.

       The relationship between historical writing and power is always problematic, and one must ask in what ways does patronage colour the construction of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. In Śrīvara's general introduction to the text, he openly writes that this work is a *niṣkṛti*, or requittal, of the debt he owes to Zayn.[209] Here is a marked difference between the work

---

[208] As a further note to complicate Śrīvara's relationship to *rasa* terminology, the fifteenth chapter of his other work, the *Kathākautuka*, is a praise of Śiva revolving around the concept of *śānta rasa*. See Chapter Seven of this dissertation.

[209] The term *niṣkṛti* occurs twice in the introduction: *ato vāñchann ameyasya tatprasādasya niṣkṛtim | so 'haṃ bravīmi tadvṛttaṃ tadguṇākṛṣṭamānasaḥ ||* "Desiring a requittal (*niṣkṛti*) of the immeasurable favor [he has shown me], I myself with a mind drawn to his [=Zayn's] virtues state the events concerning him," (*ŚJT* 1.1.12) and

of Kalhaṇa and Śrīvara's reinterpretation. The relation between poet and patron is almost entirely effaced in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (with some important and telling traces that will be discussed below), while Śrīvara acknowledges and even foregrounds his dependency on court favor. Throughout the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, he presents his relationship to court life in personal terms, giving his text an immediacy that is lacking in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (and any other Sanskrit text of which I am aware). He often depicts an unusually close relationship between Zayn and his court poet; some of the most memorable scenes of the work describe conversations between the two. For instance, in the fifth chapter, the Sultan climbs to a lake high in the Pir Pantsal Mountains to visit Viṣṇu's sacred lake. Sultan Zayn asks Śrīvara to tell him the story of the lake and the legends of the god. Being rowed about in the center of this mountain lake, Zayn reclines in a boat listening to Śrīvara recite the *Gitagovinda* while snow begins to fall:

> gītagovindagītāni mattaḥ śrutavataḥ prabhoḥ |
> govindabhaktisaṃsikto rasaḥ ko 'py udabhūt tadā || 100 ||
> kuñjapratiśruto mañjur gītanādas tadāvayoḥ |
> anugīta ivātrasthaiḥ kiṃnarai rājagauravāt || 101 ||
> kṣaṇaṃ saro'ntaś carato himavṛṣṭinibhād vibhoḥ |
> bhaktiprītair ivonmuktaṃ devaiḥ kusumavarṣaṇam || 102 ||

> Hearing songs from the *Gītagovinda* from me, a wondrous sentiment (*ko'pi rasaḥ*) raining down the devotion of Viṣṇu Govinda arose for the king. The melodious tune struck up by both our voices echoed from the thickets [on the bank] as if repeated out of veneration to the king by the *kiṃnara*-s staying there. Suddenly, gods showered forth flowers in the form of snowfall upon the king as he moved about on the lake, as if pleased at his devotion.[210]

In this story, Śrīvara is a musician, informant, and spiritual guide, but here he also appears to be a personal friend or confidant. In a similar vein comes an episode in the seventh and last chapter of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. As death approaches, Zayn calls Śrīvara to comfort him. Śrīvara recites from the *Mokṣopāya*, but substitutes stories from the life of the Sultan for the examples in the text itself:

> rājā garbhagṛhāntaḥsthaḥ śṛṇvan putrasthitiṃ mithaḥ |
> kṛtakapremavairāḍhyāṃ na bahir nirayād bhiyā || 131 ||
> saṃsāraduḥkhaśāntyarthaṃ matto vyākhyānavedinaḥ |

sātmajasya nṛpasyāsya prāpyate rājyavarṇanāt | pratiṣṭhādānasammānavidhānaguṇa-niṣkṛtiḥ || "From the description of the reign of the king (=Zayn) along with his son (=Hajji Khān=Hāydar Shāh), a requittal (*niṣkṛti*) is obtained for the favor of bestowing gifts and arranging my livelihood." (*ŚRT* 1.1.17). The second verse is probably a later interpolation made by Śrīvara after the first composition of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. Even if it is not an "original" part of the composition, it shows the importance of the concept in regards to the production and patronage in the fifteenth century Kashmiri court.
[210] *ŚRT* 1.7.100-102.

aśṛṇod gaṇarātraṃ sa śrīmokṣopāyasaṃhitām || 132 ||
svakaṇṭhasvarabhaṅgyāhaṃ tadvṛttaparivartanaiḥ |
vyākhyām akaravaṃ yena niḥśoko 'bhūt kṣaṇaṃ nṛpaḥ || 133 ||

The king stayed within his innermost chambers and listened in secret to
the position of his sons—full of hated and feigned affection. Out of fear
he did not dare venture outside. Over the course of several nights he
listened to the *Mokṣopāyasaṃhitā*[211] from me as I commented upon it in
order to pacify the sorrow of existence in the world (*saṃsāra*).
Modulating the sound of my own voice, I made an exposition by
substituting events from his own life [into the telling of the *Mokṣopāya*]
(*tadvṛttaparivartaiḥ*). Through that, the king became instantly free from
all sorrow.[212]

Unfortunately, a detailed analysis of the presence of the *Mokṣopāya* in Śrīvara's histories
is beyond the scope of this chapter. Here however, I would like to stress two details of
this story: first, that Śrīvara is close at hand during Zayn's final days teaching him about
the means to final liberation, and second that this selection hints at other sources for
historical and biographical information encoded in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*. This also provides
some corroboration for the reasons given for Śrīvara's substitution of *vairāgya* for *śānta*
in the introduction of his work. The salvific nature of both a recitation of the *Mokṣopāya*
and the story of Zayn himself is hinted at. Here, Śrīvara is seen actually narrating the life
of Zayn to Zayn himself as framed and organised by the *Mokṣopāya*. It seems that
Śrīvara's role as *paṇḍit* to the Sultan invited him to explore other ways of organizing a
royal biography. Again, it is this closeness to Zayn that demands and allows this
rewriting of both the *Mokṣopāya* and of a Kalhaṇa-style history.

That personal closeness should not be underestimated as a cause for the radical
way in which Śrīvara reimagines the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* genre. The *Jainataraṅgiṇī* has a first-
person, documentary feel that is completely lacking in Kalhaṇa's work. The relationship
between Zayn and Śrīvara is something quite different than anything in Kalhaṇa's
Rājataraṅgiṇī. Thus Śrīvara must change the way kings, kingship and fate are
represented. For Kalhaṇa, who cultivates the perspective of a disinterested spectator, the
mutable nature (*nisarga*) of kings is foregrounded. Kalhaṇa writes at the end of the
eighth chapter of his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*:

ambho 'pi pravahatsvabhāvam aśanair āśyānam aśmāyate
grāvāmbhaḥ sravati dravatvam uditodrekeṣu cāveyuṣaḥ |
kālasyāskhalitaprabhāvarabhasaṃ bhāti prabhutve 'dbhute
kasyāmutra vidhātṛśaktighaṭite mārge nisargaḥ sthiraḥ |

---

[211] The term used by Śrīvara, *śrīmokṣopāyasaṃhitā*, seems to refer to the text known
simply as the *Mokṣopāya*, although it could conceivably also denote a shortened version
of some sort. *Saṃhitā* could simply mean a methodically arranged verse work. See
Monier-Williams, *s. v.*
[212] *ŚRT* 1.7.131-133.

Even the water, which is liquid by nature, freezes and turns in time (?) hard as stone, [while] the stone may dissolve into water. Under that wonderful dominion of Time, which has witnessed, even in beings of exceptional greatness, the rapid change of unlimited might, whose nature (*nisarga*) can remain unchanged on the road laid out by the power of the creator?[213]

This verse is a summation of the entire organisational philosophy of Kalhaṇa's moral and aesthetic universe. Here again Kalhaṇa uses a liquid metaphor and emphasises the mutability of kings and kingdoms through the actions of fate/the creator (*vidhātṛ*). Here, the actions of fate actually change the nature (*nisarga*) of the kings. One should note that there are important hints that Kalhaṇa was intimately (and perhaps problematically) connected with court life during the reign of Jayasiṃha,[214] yet Kalhaṇa does not rely on

---

[213] *RT* 8.3406 trans. Stein, 267-8. The annotations including the "(?)" are from Stein's original translation.
[214] *iyadṛṣṭam ananyatra prajāpuṇyair mahībhujaḥ |*
paripākamanojñatvaṃ stheyāt kalpāgatāḥ samāḥ || RT 8.3405 ||

"May the matured wisdom of this king [which has been produced] by the subjects' merits and which has not been seen to such an extent in any other [ruler], last for years exceeding this Kalpa!" (Trans. Stein)

As an aside, a verse preserved in Ratnakaṇṭha's unpublished *Sārasamuccaya* seems to give some credence to the Kashmiri tradition that Kalhaṇa was the author of some sort of *praśasti* of King Jayasiṃha (r. 1129-1150) called the *Jayasiṃhābhyudaya*. As quoted in Peterson's edition of Vallabhadeva's *Subhāṣitāvali*, (p. 18), this verse praises a certain ruler:

> *bhūbhṛtpadaṃ parvataśeṣam āsīt*
> *tasthau vidhāv eva ca rājaśabdaḥ |*
> *na vāhinīnāthakathā samudrād*
> *anyatra tasmin nṛpatau babhūva ||*

> The word "Earth-bearer" (*bhūbhṛt*) was saved for the mountains,
> And the word "Rāja" stood only for the moon,
> There was no-one to call "River-lord" (*vāhinīnātha*) other than the ocean
> When he was the king.

This verse relies on double meanings inherent in certain Sanskrit words for "king", thus *bhūbhṛt* means mountain and king, *rājā* moon and king, *vāhinīnātha* means ocean and commander-in-chief (since *vāhinī* can mean both river and army). Although it is impossible to extrapolate a specific relationship between Kalhaṇa and Jayasiṃha (or any other ruler) from the testimony of this verse alone, it could point to a more complex role for Kalhaṇa in Kashmiri court life.

the power of fate or the creator as a completely external agent. That is, Kalhaṇa does not accept the character of a king as a stable and praiseworthy; rather, the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* emphasises a fickle and mutable human nature. Fate as shown in the culminating verse of the entire *Rājataraṅgiṇī* acts internally to and in consort with the character (*nisarga*) of kings, not merely manifested in the trials and tribulations of the outside world. In this, Kalhaṇa writes with, and even cultivates, a sense of distance from the events, so that the moral and aesthetic point can be experienced by a *taṭastha* spectator.

Śrīvara's description of the king is paradoxically both much more visceral and immediate yet more controlled. The *Jainataraṅgiṇī*, as its name suggests, is intimately tied with the aesthetics of royal representation, yet it does this in a very new way. The poetics of *praśasti*, or royal panegyric, is well-established in the Sanskrit literary tradition; however, because of the aesthetic undergirding given by the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* cannot be said to move within the same poetic expectations as these praise poems. As an heir to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*'s artistic and moral universe, the idea of mutability and change inherent in the production of central aesthetic experience of *vairāgya* must still be central, yet in the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* the character of the king must remain fixed. As with the telescoping of chronology, the thematic arrangement serves to bypass the unwanted consequence of following the logic of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, namely that the character of the king must be somehow mutable. Śrīvara's experimental attitude towards chronology allows him to present a picture of the king in a method reminiscent of the use of flashbacks in films. Zayn comes across as a complete character, but a character judiciously controlled through Śrīvara's editing eye. In this editing process, fate is thus removed from the nature of Zayn and is made an all-controlling external agent, to whom one must always succumb. The rise and fall, and the concomitant production of the feeling of *vairāgya* that a Kalhaṇa-based historiography expects is thus accomplished without attributing anything but the best intentions to Zayn.

In the end, the *vairāgya* that is engendered by the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* has a different feel from the *śānta* of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Although the exact relationship between Kalhaṇa and the court is unclear, he attempted to keep some sort of distance between himself and his text. This is a sort of *śānta* that stands in sharp distinction to the feel of Śrīvara's work, which has a much more personal, elegiac feel. This subjective emphasis on the "feel" or "texture" of Sanskrit text leads back to the formal or literary imaginary that underlies the entirety of the work. In Kalhaṇa, the mutability of the characters of all kings is taken for granted (with the important, yet understated, exception of Jayasiṃha, the contemporary king[215]). Śrīvara is writing his history at the end of history; there is only the contemporary king. Śrīvara's creativity lies in the imagination of a new sort of poetic and historical space which allows the translation of events into literature. His adaptation of new modes of expression captures and commemorate the subtle contours of a unique royal personality.

Furthermore, the sons of Kalhaṇa are identified as a powerful and problem-causing political faction by Jonarāja in his *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. All of these descendants are killed. For the sons of Kalhaṇa their political and military career and their fate, see Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, especially vs 94-105.

[215] See again McCrea's "*Śāntarasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*".

6.4: Conclusion: The End and Everything After.

Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī* shows a unique negotiation between conflicting influences: it is at once shaped and informed by Kalhaṇa's construction and historiography while at the same time attempting to develop a new form demanded by the particularities of his moment in Kashmir. The *Jainataraṅgiṇī* is thus an experiment in the relevance and elasticity of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as a textual model. This chapter concentrated on two aspects of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī*: the way in which Śrīvara stretched the Sanskrit language to accommodate newness, and the way in which he stretched the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre to accommodate a new vision of patron-centered historical writing. Reading these two together can begin to reveal Śrīvara's vision for a Sanskrit literature able to articulate a vision of the Kashmiri Sultanate.

I argue that Śrīvara's vision is a form of vernacularized Sanskrit. It is one that strives to make itself a vehicle for the articulation of the new realities of the Shāh Mīrī Sultanate. To do this he must radically reimagine the possibilities of the Sanskrit language and the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre. In the case of his biography of Zayn, the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* is a success; yet in the grand trajectory of Sanskrit writing in Kashmir, it remains an anomaly. Śrīvara's own continuation of the text detailing the reigns of Hassan Shāh and Mohammad Shāh return to a chronological description of the events at the court.[216] We can perhaps attribute this change in form to an increasing distance between Śrīvara and the later rulers of the Kashmiri Sultanate. Perhaps the tensions involved in creating a "contemporary biography" depended on a certain sort of personal relationship that was unable to be replicated later. In any case, the formal and experimental exuberance that characterized the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* is absent in Śrīvara's later *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. One might speculate that the reign of Zayn was a special moment in the history of second-millennium Sanskrit literature, one that turned outward and was willing to embrace new forms and experiment with tradition, and that this moment was in the end unable to be integrated within the institutional history and so the poetic imagination of Kashmir.

As a conclusion, I must stress that Sanskrit history writing does not end with the death of Zayn in Kashmir. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* as a literary form not only provides a vast untapped resource for the history of Kashmir from the last pre-Islamic *rājā*-s and the Sultanate to the Mughals, Sikhs and Dogras but also provides an archive of Kashmiri Sanskrit literary culture confronted with changing religious, political, and social realities. However, Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī* shows the most radical departure in form and philosophy. After the death of Zayn, something changes in the histories. Hereafter they never approach the level of personal connection with the ruler or the same level of creative engagement with history writing.

Śrīvara's histories of the later Shāh Mīrī rulers ends abruptly in 1486. The end of his *Rājataraṅgiṇī* comes after a long, diffuse, and confusing discussion of a civil war fought between various factions of the Kashmiri elite. The end of history for Śrīvara is a halting and stuttering descent into chaos; the last verse of his *Rājataraṅgiṇī* offers praise of Fateh Shāh, one of the rebel leaders who fought against Moḥammad Shāh, the king

---

[216] In this context we can perhaps understand Śrīvara's calling himself a "mere clerk" in the introduction to the narrative of the reigns of these kings.

whose history Śrīvara ostensibly writes. The end of Śrīvara's histories of the later Shāh Mīrīs seems to cry out for that same stability which allowed his *Jainataraṅgiṇī* to operate. With the disappearance of the special relationship between Zayn and his historian, the carefully constructed world of the *Jainataraṅgiṇī* gradually disappears. Interestingly, Śrīvara reappears in the court of a newly reinstalled Moḥammad Shāh in 1505, yet he does not return to history. As I will show in the next chapter, he instead returns to the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* genre to provide a new sort of Sanskrit for the Kashmiri court.

CHAPTER 7: The *Kathākautuka*: Sanskrit, Persian, and Translation in Sultanate Kashmir

7.1 Introduction: A Sanskrit *Ślokakathā* in a Persianizing Court

   Śrīvara's histories of the Sultans of Kashmir sputter to an end in 1486, and Śrīvara disappears from the record of political and courtly life in Kashmir for almost twenty years.[217] While Sanskrit histories do begin to be written again after the Mughal annexation of the Valley in 1586, the mode of biographical history that Śrīvara honed in his description of Zayn never again became an integral part of elite Kashmiri expression. In the broad narrative of the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre, Śrīvara's experimental historiography was a failure, but Śrīvara's innovative voice does, however, make one final appearance during the reign of Zayn's decendant Moḥammad Shāh (r. ca. 1484-1537).[218] In April of 1505,[219] Śrīvara presents the strange and evocative work entitled the *Kathākautuka*, or *The Wonder of Story* to the court of the often beleaguered Moḥammad Shāh. Śrīvara's last known work, the *Kathākautuka* blazes a new path in Sanskrit literary history; this strange, innovative, and understudied work translates a Ṣūfī-themed Persian narrative poem (*mathnavī*) into Sanskrit verse.

   Śrīvara's source is Abdur Raḥmān Jāmī's Persian narrative poem (*mathnavī*) the *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā.* Composed in Timurid Herat in 1484, Jāmī recasts and refigures the Qur'ānic narrative of Yūsuf (Biblical Joseph) and Zulaykhā (Potiphar's unnamed wife) into a powerful Ṣūfī tale of desire and the ultimate quest for God. As a reimagination of Jāmī's Persian, the *Kathākautuka* moves Jāmī's work not only geographically from the Central Asian Timurid capital of Herat into the Kashmiri court of Moḥammad Shāh but also culturally from the Islamicate[220] outlook of the Persian telling to a Sanskritic[221]

---

[217] The history of the later Shāh Mīrīs is known only from Persian sources, the earliest and most important of which is the *Bahāristān-i Shāhī*, which details the power struggles between various warring factions in Kashmir.[217] From this source (which was probably written in 1614), we can begin to map out the fractious political world of the late fifteenth century, yet the literary creativity that the reign of Sultan Zayn oversaw went into hibernation after 1486.

[218] The reign of Moḥammad Shāh was especially turbulent; he was deposed no fewer than four times. For further information on his reign, see Mohibbul Hasan, *Kashmir Under the Sultans* (Delhi: Aakar Books, 2005), 115–29. The *Kathākautuka* is dated to April of 1505, later that year Moḥammad Shāh was deposed by Faṭh Shāh for the second time.

[219] Śrīvara is oddly precise in the dating of this text, giving the date in two different reckoning systems (Laukika and Śāka). This is an anomaly in the Sanskrit literary tradition, in which authors usually do not date their compositions.

[220] Marshall Hodgson's useful term "Islamicate" "refer[s] not directly to the religion, Islam, itself, but to the social and cultural complex historically associated with Islam and the Muslims, both among Muslims themselves and when found among non-Muslims." Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, 59. In this chapter I also use the term "Persianate" in a closely allied but slightly restricted sense, meaning Islamicate culture refracted through Persian-speaking elite culture.

milieu. Śrīvara's project of bringing such a text into the Sanskrit language is unprecedented in the history of Sanskrit literature; in undertaking this project not only must Śrīvara translate the words of Jāmī's poem but also the underlying ideas, customs, literary tropes, and religious ideas which undergird and inform the makeup of the *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā*. When faced with such a surprising and unique work,[222] the modern reader is confronted with the difficulty of placing this text within the history of Sanskrit literary culture in South Asia. The *Kathākautuka* must be first contextualized within the fluid ecology of Sultanate Kashmir, the creative ferment which gave rise to Śrīvara's innovative histories.

To understand the *Kathākautuka* one must begin with its source, Jāmī's *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā*. Jāmī's Persian poem quickly captured the imagination of the Persian-speaking world and circulated widely after its first appearance, both as a text to be read in Persian and as the basis for various translations into regional languages. The speed of the Persian text's diffusion and the linguistic range of its vernacular retellings are striking. However, among these later instantiations inspired by Jāmī's poem perhaps none is more intriguing than its earliest known translation, the Sanskrit iteration in the Kashmiri court of Moḥammad Shāh. Although its Persian transmission and reception within the valley of Kashmir has yet to be studied, the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* was clearly well-known enough to merit the attention of the Sultan and of the *paṇḍita* Śrīvara. While other translations present Jāmī's work in the context of the Dār al-Islām as it speaks to Muslim (or culturally Islamic) audiences,[223] in contrast Śrīvara firmly roots his telling in specifically non-Islamic, "Hindu" terms. The result is a translation that is a transformation, at once a careful reading of Jāmī's original words and a radical departure. Śrīvara translates not only the words of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* but also the underlying worldview: thus the Muslim story of the Prophet Yūsuf and the beautiful Zulaykhā becomes a Hindu tale of the *avatāra* Yosobha and Jolekhā.

While we have no other evidence of textual transmission culminating in a translation project like Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka*, the movement of people and ideas between Central Asia and Kashmir—from musicians to Sufi saints and religious figures, from artists to craftsmen—is fairly well documented. Simon Digby's article "Export Industries and Handicraft Production under the Sultans of Kashmir" points to the dense

---

[221] Here I use the term "Sanskritic" in contradistinction to Hodgson's Islamicate, although strictly speaking it is more parallel to the term "Persianate" defined above. "Sanskritic" refers to elite productions and dispositions encoded in the Sanskrit language. I employ the term "Sanskritic" to emphasize the cultural-linguistic aspect of these texts.
[222] To my knowledge, the *Kathākautuka* stands as the only Sanskrit literary text that translates a specific literary work from outside the Indic cultural milieu in premodernity. Kalyāṇa Malla's early sixteenth century *Sulaimaccarita* recasts narratives from the Biblical story of Solomon and Bathsheba and the Arabic *One Thousand and One Nights*, but it does not deal with a specific source text. For more on the *Sulaimaccarita*, its content, and its history, see Christopher Minkowski's inaugural lecture at Oxford "King David in Oudh: a Bible story in Sanskrit and the Just King at an Afghan Court." http://users.ox.ac.uk/~ball2185/Minkowski.Inaugural.pdf (Mar. 7, 2006) and Obrock, "Muslim *Mahākāvyas*," forthcoming.
[223] There is however a Georgian translation that is explicitly Christian in its outlook.

interconnections in material culture between Kashmir and Central and South Asia. Particularly interesting are the remembered connections preserved in Persian sources between Sikandar Shāh and his son Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn with Timurid Khorasan.[224] The circulation of material objects and artisanal skills speaks to a larger sphere of transmission and translation in which Kashmir stands as an important node. It is fair to imagine the transmission of literary texts like Jāmī's *mathnavī* following the same pathways, and indeed valorized by the same participants in the exchange. Understanding circulation in terms of material culture might provide a way to conceptualize the transmission and reception of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* and its transformation in Śrīvara's hands.

   In brief, the *Kathākautuka* is a poetic work in fifteen chapters and retells the story of the love of the lovely noblewoman Jolekhā (Persian Zulaykhā) for the handsome Yosobha (Persian Yūsuf). While such tales of love and longing are not unfamiliar in the Sanskrit literary tradition, in an interesting reversal of gender roles in the *Kathākautuka*, as in the Persian *Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā*, it is the woman who pines for and strives after the male beloved. The *Kathākautuka* cuts back and forth between the stories of Jolekhā and Yosobha, including her dreams of the handsome man, and his rebuff of her advances, and their final union. This tale is also firmly rooted in religious ideas and ideals, in which Jolekhā must first give over herself to God (for Śrīvara Śambhu or Śiva) before reaching union with Yosobha.

   An anomaly in the perceived insularity of the Sanskrit language and literature, Śrīvara imagines a very specific place for the *Kathākautuka* in Sanskrit literary history. Like the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the Kashmiri *kathā* tradition, the *Kathākautuka* actively appropriates and transforms sources from outside of the Indic tradition. As the word *kathā* in the title suggests, Śrīvara ties the *Kathākautuka* to the tradition of Kashmiri *ślokakathā* literature in form, structure, and language and presents a finished project very much in the lineage of Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*. The content of the work confirms literary resonances of the title; throughout the work Śrīvara uses the meter, language, and style of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* genre, and he introduces and frames his project in similar language. However, the *Kathākautuka* extends the translational methodology of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* genre to new and uncharted territories beyond the scope of Somadeva's literary imagination. And, although its meter and its theme of love is ubiquitous throughout the Sanskrit literary tradition, Śrīvara's text still surprises. Unlike many other languages and literary traditions, Sanskrit was rarely a language that one translated into, there was no tradition of translation, nor was there even a word for the phenomenon.[225] More striking still, Śrīvara recast a story with deep roots in Islamic religious culture, especially Sūfism. Why then did Śrīvara choose to translate a Persian text into the "unaging language" (*nirjarābhāṣā*) of Sanskrit? What drew his attention to Jāmī? Finally how can we contextualize Śrīvara, his *Kathākautuka*, and his translational choices in reading the Persian in the larger world of Jāmī's textual diffusion and cultural relevance? This chapter contextualizes Śrīvara's translation of the Persian text within the

---

[224] See Simon Digby, "Export Industries and Handicraft Production under the Sultanates of Kashmir," *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 44/4 (2007): esp. 407–10.

[225] The modern word *anuvāda* used in many languages does not mean "translation" in Sanskrit.

late Shāh Mīrī court and asks why such a project was undertaken and what the *Kathākautuka* can tell us about the ecology of languages and texts in the early sixteenth century Kashmiri Sultanate.

From its very inception the *Kathākautuka* presents a challenge to the scholar of Jāmī, Sanskrit, or medieval textual circulation. Śrīvara does not translate the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā,* rather he radically transforms it. From the perspective of cosmopolitan Sanskrit literary culture, the choice of an Islamic source is so rare as to be unique in the grand trajectory of Sanskrit literary history.[226] Further, in comparison to other pathways of Islamic textual diffusion in South Asia in the second millennium, Śrīvara's Kashmiri telling does not attempt to speak to coreligionists or even prospective converts, either Hindu or Muslim. Why then does the *Kathākautuka* so radically deracinate the story of the handsome Yūsuf and the pining Zulaykhā and circumscribe it within another canon of textual expectations?

To answer to this question, this chapter focuses attention on the choices Śrīvara makes and the world that he creates. Specifically, I look at the connections to Kashmiri *ślokakathā,* his translation of the Persian language, and his translation of Islamicate concepts. To make the literary world of the *Kathākautuka* possible, Śrīvara marshals a wide variety of texts, including Kashmiri Sanskrit story literature (*kathā*), Śiva-centered theology and cosmogony, and *rasa*-based aesthetic theory. However much he draws upon these texts, the *Kathākautuka* does not become a text in any of these traditions. Rather Śrīvara reconfigures these concepts in new and creative ways, each standing in a new and somewhat surprising relationship with the others. This Sanskritic basis forged by Śrīvara acts in active conversation with the Persian text. This constellation of ideas and influences speaks to a context in which elite culture too was negotiating its own existence.

The Sanskritic substratum of the *Kathākautuka* extends from the literary genre and register in which Śrīvara writes to the underlying operational logic of the story. This change in worldview is most clearly obvious in Śrīvara's insistence on a Śaiva (that is, centered on the great God Śiva) religious affiliation and cosmological substratum. Although Śrīvara painstakingly crafts a Sanskritic cosmology standing in place of Jāmī's Islamic worldview, religious polemics does not lie at the center of Śrīvara's project. Rather Śrīvara's undertaking is nuanced by the particular circumstances of the elite Sultanate culture in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The *Kathākautuka* speaks to a knowing courtly audience and revels in the act of translation as self-aware verbal play. That is, the *Kathākautuka* is not a text documenting an "encounter" between two religious groups, but rather as a literary work reflecting an already intertwined court culture.

---

[226] Perhaps the strange and understudied *Sulaimaccarita* could also be classed as such a work. This sixteenth century work retells of the story of David (Davudu) and Batsheba (Saptasutā) and culminates in a retelling of the Jinn and the Fisherman which itself figures in *The One Thousand and One Nights* (See Minkowski's "King David in Oudh" and Obrock "Muslim *Mahākāvya*s."). Further research on pre-modern (and especially pre-Mughal) Sanskrit literary texts is needed to identify further translational projects and arenas of literary exchange in South Asia.

7.2: The *Kathākautuka* and the Kashmiri *kathā* tradition

So how can we map the transformation of a Central Asian Persian Ṣūfī-inflected *mathnavī* as it becomes a Kashmiri Sanskrit Hindu *kathā*? At the most macroscopic level, Śrīvara follows the contours of Jāmī's basic story fairly closely. Structurally, the Sanskrit poem is divided into fifteen chapters ranging from approximately thirty to more than one hundred and fifty couplets. Beginning with an introductory chapter, Śrīvara then moves to a description of Jolekhā and her beauty, her dreams of the handsome Yosobha, and her pining away because of her unrequited love for him. Here already we notice an interesting reordering: where the Persian first introduces the beauty of Yūsuf=Yosobha, Śrīvara chooses to begin with Zulaykhā=Jolekhā. The *Kathākautuka* then shifts its focus to Yosobha and describes his great beauty. The rest of the story is well-known. His brothers become jealous and leave him for dead in the desert. He is found by a traveling merchant caravan and taken as a slave. His beauty dazzles the crowds in Egypt as he reminds them of the true beauty of the one true God.[227] Jolekhā sees him and falls madly in love, but he rebuffs her advances, and she has him thrown in prison. He is freed for his skill in dream-interpretation, is richly rewarded, and is reunited with his family. Jolekhā finally turns to God (in the *Kathākautuka*, Śambhu or Śiva), and in her submission to him regains her youth and unites with Yosobha. The whole work then ends with Chapter Fifteen, a short hymn in of praise of the great God Śiva.

While the *Kathākautuka* contains most of the episodes in Jāmī's Persian text, Śrīvara often reorders and reworks the content, giving a different feeling to both individual episodes as well as the story as a whole. Even given his own careful engagement with the language of the Persian original, at a fundamental level Śrīvara radically reconstitutes both the root story and its Persianate cultural and Islamic religious assumptions. Śrīvara's project of making Sanskrit relevant for both Sanskrit-knowing audiences and the court of Moḥammad Shāh again turns to the *ślokakathā* genre to provide the basic frame for his rewriting of the Jāmī's text. Again, the models of the eleventh and twelfth centuries provide patterns for Sanskrit engagements with a Persianate present.

I begin by placing the *Kathākautuka*'s introduction in conversation with the *Kathāsaritsāgara* in order to show the deep resonances between these two *ślokakathā* texts. Almost immediately in his first chapter Śrīvara addresses the larger issues of bringing Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* to the court in a new linguistic and cultural guise. The second verse hints toward Śrīvara's understanding of the larger issues underlying such a translational project. He writes:

praṇamya vighnaughaharaṃ gaṇeśaṃ tridhāmarūpām api bhāratīṃ tām |
viracyate yāvanaśāstrabaddhā kathā mayā nirjarabhāṣayeyam ||1.2||[228]

---

[227] For an account of this episode which culminates of the conversion of Baghiza (in Sanskrit Deyā), see my forthcoming essay "Muslim *Mahākāvyas*."

[228] Here and throughout I cite from my own provisional edition of the *Kathākautuka*, which is based on a close reading of the two published editions. Although I am currently re-editing the text from manuscripts, here the verses quoted are based on a comparison of

After bowing to Gaṇeśa, who takes away the flood of obstacles and also to the Goddess of Speech, manifest in [her] three powers (*tridhāmarūpā*), I compose this story (*kathā*) connected to Muslim *śāstra* (*yāvanaśāstrabaddhā*) in the unaging language [of Sanskrit].

Here Śrīvara is clearly following the model of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and its translational logic, as a comparison of the second and third verses will show. Somadeva writes:

> *saṃdhyānṛttotsave tārāḥ kareṇoddhūya vighnajit |*
> *sītkārasīkarair anyāḥ kalpayann iva pātu vaḥ ||1.2||*
> *praṇamya vācaṃ niḥśeṣapadārthoddyotadīpikām |*
> *bṛhatkathāyāḥ sārasya saṃgrahaṃ rācayāmy aham ||1.3||*

> After sweeping away the stars with his trunk in the joy of his evening dance and seeming to create others with the droplets of water of his spray, may that one who conquers obstacles (*vighnajit*=Gaṇeśa) protect you. Having bowed to the Goddess Speech, the lamp that illuminates all things without exeption, I compose (*racayāmi*) the brief version of the essence of the *Bṛhatkathā*.

Here Śrīvara resorts to traditional Sanskrit benedictory tropes (the homage to elephant-headed Gaṇeśa as the remover of obstacles, the Goddess Speech conceptualized in a certain way) and the valorization of the Sanskrit language itself as "unaging" (*nirjara*), and an intention of purpose to transform an existing work using the Sanskrit root √*rac*, to fashion or create (Śrivara uses the passive with the *upasarga vi-*, *viracyate*). Here Śrīvara says very much the same thing although he combines the sentiments of Somadeva's two *śloka*-s into a single fourty-four syllable *triṣṭubh* verse. Śrīvara draws upon the translational force of the *ślokakathā* and provides a similar framing of his own project. While the importance of the earlier Kashmiri models cannot be underestimated, the standard *ślokakathā* tropes are juxtaposed against a new interlocutor, the *śāstra* of the Yavanas[229] or Muslims. The Sanskrit term *śāstra* is often translated as any religious, scientific, or philosophical treatise, but here I would prefer something analogous to "canon" in the sense of a specific high-cultural textual tradition. With the term m*yāvanaśāstra*, Śrīvara recognizes Jāmī's work as subject to another set of formal, aesthetic, and religious expectations. Śrīvara implicitly argues that the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* can only be brought into the realm of a normative Sanskrit discourse by careful attention to the ideological underpinnings of the *yāvanaśāstra* to which it is bound and which binds it together. This recognition brings the most striking aspect of the *Kathākautuka*

---

the two published editions. In the notes, S refers to Richard Schmidt's 1893 edition of the *Kathākautuka* and K refers to Kāśīnātha Paṇḍuraṅga Paraba's 1901 *Kāvyamālā* edition.

[229] In the compound *yāvanaśāstrabaddhā*, Śrīvara uses the *taddhita* adjectival form *yāvana* meaning "of or from the Yavanas" or perhaps even "Islamic"

into sharper focus: Although Śrīvara's Sanskrit telling[230] of Jāmī's text often remains close to the original Persian, regularly translating entire strings of verses almost verbatim, Śrīvara must not only transform the words, but also the cultural and religious context of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*. The introduction of this term broadens the scope of the *ślokakathā* beyond the horizons of Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* to include ideas outside of the purview of Indic knowledge systems.

Immediately following the previously quoted benedictory verse, Śrīvara gives a statement of translational verisimilitude again echoing Somadeva while still pushing the boundaries of the genre. Śrīvara writes:

> *krameṇa yena bhautārtho mallājyāmena varṇitaḥ |*
> *tenaiva hi mayā so 'yam ślokenādya nirūpyate ||1.3||*

> Whatever order the root meaning (*bhautārthaḥ*) was depicted by Mullā Jāmī (*mallājyāma*), in the very same [order] it is reproduced (*nirūpyate*) in verse by me.[231]

---

[230] Here I tend to use the term "telling". Writing on the transmission and translation history of Sanskrit epic the *Rāmāyaṇa*, A. K. Ramanujan writes "I have come to prefer the word *tellings* to the usual terms *versions* or *variants* because the latter terms typically do imply that there is an invariant, an original *Ur*-text—usually Valmīki's Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇa* […]. But […] it is not always Valmīki's narrative that is carried from one language to another" Ramanujan, "Three Hundred Rāmāyaṇas: Five Examples and Three Thoughts on Translation," in *The Collected Essays of A. K. Ramanujan*, ed. V. Dharwadker (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004): 135. While the *Kathākautuka* is not exactly parallel to the examples Ramanujan cites in his piece, I think the term telling allows space for other influences, expectations, and pressures which shape this particular instantiation of Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*.

[231] The compound *bhautārtha* is a bit puzzling, however, even without emending the text I would point to the somehow parallel compound *bhūtārtha* used by Kalhaṇa when he describes his own "translational" undertaking in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*:

> *dākṣyaṃ kiyad idaṃ tasmād asmin bhūtārthavarṇane |*
> *sarvaprakāraṃ skhalite yojanāya mamodyamaḥ ||1.10||*

Stein translates this as

> Hence *my* endeavour is to give a connected account where the narrative of past events has become fragmentary in many respects.

In this case Stein translates *bhūtārtha* as "past events". It seems possible that Śrīvara's *bhautārtha* could be emended to *bhūtārtha*, however "past events" does not make good sense in Śrīvara's text. Following Slaje's understanding of Kalhaṇa's use of *bhūtārtha* as equivalent to *yathābhūtārtha* meaning "the actual or fundamental meaning," Śrīvara's deployment of the same or similar meaning can become more clear. See Slaje, "Kalhaṇa Reconsidered," 235, esp. n. 97.

One immediately recalls Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* verse already discussed in Chapter Two:

> *yathā mūlaṃ tathaivatan na manāg apy atikramaḥ |*
> *granthavistarasaṃkṣepamātraṃ bhāṣā ca bhidyate ||1.10||*

> As the source text (*mūlaṃ*) so much [is written here], without even a tiny bit of deviation. There is only an abridgment of the extent of the book, and the language is different.

The key term *krama* is repeated in both, and both texts declare fidelity to their sources, a felicity that is soon called into question. The next section will detail Śrīvara's broadening of the *ślokakathā*'s scope to translate the very different poetic world of Ṣūfī-inflected Persian.

7.3 The Mechanics of Translation in the *Kathākautuka*

Perhaps unsurprisingly given the history of the *ślokakathā* genre, Śrīvara's promise of following the original order of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* is almost immediately belied by the actual content of the *Kathākautuka* itself. Jāmī's tale, undergirded by specifically Sufi conceptions of God, love, and salvation, must be retold through Sanskrit concepts and mapped on a Sanskritic world, from its language and meter to its cosmogony and conceptions of love. While a careful study of the entirety of the *Kathākautuka* and the various aspects of its translation methodology are to be desired, I here pay careful attention to certain of Śrīvara's transformational choices, the historical context, and the mechanisms of his translation. Here I will frame the transmission and reception of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* in terms of a radical act of translation that manifests itself in a reimagining of the very bases of Jāmī's Persianate and Islamicate worldview. The following two sections will detail the negotiations underlying the creation of the *Kathākautuka*. I first look at a detailed comparison of the poetics of the Sanskrit in comparison with the Persian. Second, the distinct aesthetics of Sanskrit versus Persian poetry is evident in the side-by-side comparisons: the measured, compact, and somewhat elliptical construction of the Persian is met with the more filled out Sanskrit confined by tighter rules of grammar. Here I begin by studying the four verses in Jāmī's introduction and their Sanskrit renderings. Jāmī's first verse reads:

> 1. *ilāhi ghunche-yi ummīd begushāy*
>   *gūlī az rauze-yi jāvīd benumāy*

> O God, cause the bud of hope to blossom
>   Reveal a flower from the eternal garden.

This is translated into Sanskrit as:

> *prabodhayāśākalikāṃ prasādamadhunā prabho |*
> *tadutpannepsitaṃ phalaṃ dātum arhasi me śubham ||1.4||*

> Awaken the bud of hope through the springtime (*madhu*) of your grace, o
>> Lord, please give me the auspicious fruit, which is the desired
>> result springing from it.

The question arises whether or not this is a translation at all. The main idea is similar in the first half of both verses. The poet beseeches God (*ilahi/prabhu*) to open (*begushāy/prabodhaya*) the bud of hope (*ghunche-ye ummīd/āśākalikā*). Interestingly Śrīvara here goes further and adds another instrumental metaphoric compound *prasādamadhunā* describing exactly how God would open the bud.

      The second half shows a real divergence; where Jāmī introduces paradisiacal notions with his phrase *rauze-ye jāvīd*, Śrīvara goes in a completely different direction, instead his verse introduces a fruit—in Śrīvara's conception, the fruit, not the bud is the important point. Indeed, notions of paradise have little currency in Sanskritic benedictory stanzas. The ultimate *phala* or goal in Indic systems is rather *mokṣa* or liberation.

      The following verse shows another shift from the Persianate/Islamic into the Sanskritic/Hindu. Jāmī here speaks for the first time using specifically Sufi language and imagery.

> 3. *dar īn miḥnat-sarāyi bī muvāsā*
>> *be niʿmat-hā-yi khwīsh-am kun shināsā*

> In this house of affliction devoid of patronage/ease (*muvāsā*)
>> Make me acquainted with your graces

The Sanskrit reads:

> *asāre khalu saṃsāre cintāśatasamākule |*
> *ajñānāndhasya deveśa prakāśaṃ me nidarśaya ||1.6||*

> Indeed in the endless round of rebirths (*saṃsāra*) devoid of any real
> essence, overflowing with hundreds of worries, show me who am blinded
> by ignorance, o Lord of the Gods, the light.

Jāmī uses a specific image of the world as undesirable, one which is common in the Islamicate world. Śrīvara for his part translates the conventionality of this image rather than the image itself; that is to say Jāmī's *miḥnat-sarāyi bī mavāsā* becomes *asāraḥ saṃsāraḥ*. This turn of phrase is used throughout Sanskrit literary culture, so much so that it becomes a cliché.[232]

---

[232] The phrase *asāre khalu* (or sometimes *bata*) *saṃsāre* seems to become formulaic in Sanskrit poetics in the *śloka* meter. The metrical scansion of these eight syllables fits the first or third quarter verse. The pair *asāra/saṃsāra* also appears variously throughout the poetic corpus, especially in verses dealing with *śānta*, or "world weariness" A quick scan of the *Mahāsubhāṣitasaṃgraha* (*The Great Anthology of Well-Spoken Verse*) shows thirteen verses that begin with the *asāra/saṃsāra* pair.

The point here is that translation is not literal, rather translation is based on a parallel conventionality. The ultimate thrust of both versions is almost identical — the world is unsatisfactory—Śrīvara merely turns to the stock phrase available in the Sanskrit tradition.

As a final example, Jāmī writes:

4. *zamīr-am rā sepās andīshe gardān*
    zabān-am rā sitāyish-pīshe gardān

Make my mind have thoughts of thankfulness/praise
Make my tongue have the profession of praising [you]

mano me 'stu sadā śambho bhavatsevāparaṃ param |
vaktuṃ guṇagaṇaṃ nityaṃ rasaneyaṃ pravartatām ||1.7||

May my mind always, o Śambhu, be totally intent on your service, may
this tongue ever continue to speak the multitude of your virtues.

Here we see a further translation of the religious ideas in Jāmī into religious ideas conformable to Śrīvara's world-view. The two halves of both the Persian and the Sanskrit hinge on a similar structure: beseeching God to make the heart/mind an instrument for His glory. This translation comes across well in the second half of Śrīvara's verse where it stays close to the Persian (the particularly apt translation of *gardān* with *pravartatām* both having the root meaning of "to revolve" and "to go forth" seems to me to be an indication of the closeness with which Śrīvara read the text). Yet here it seems that the *Kathākautuka* is actually more interested in cleverly following Jāmī's Persian sounds than making any effort to translate meaning. The Persian *sepās* (thankfulness) is translated by Śrīvara's *sevā* (service). Of course, the two words have different theological thrusts—*sevā* calling to mind specific *bhakti* conceptions of worship. While both have specific and particular theological valences, here the shape of the words seem important—*sepās* and *sevā* having similar phonetic value.

In each of these opening verses, we see how closely Śrīvara read the Persian, and the choices he made to render Jāmī's words into Sanskrit. What is striking here is not translational accuracy, but rather the way in which Śrīvara relies on a knowing cleverness, expecting his audience to be familiar with both Indic literary culture and Persianate modes of expression. This speaks to an underlying culture of courtly cleverness that I think animates the entirety of the *Kathākautuka*. This courtliness is demonstrated even more clearly in Śrīvara's handling of religion in his translation.

7.4 The Love of God in Sanskrit: Religion, Cosmology, and Translation in the *Kathākautuka*

From the language of the text I move to the organizing theological principles of both the *Yūsuf va zulaykhā* and the *Kathākautuka*. I concentrate specifically on the translation of either the most universal or the most particular concept of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*—love. This concept is most universal in that every culture deals with romantic

love in its literature, and most particular given that the conception of love in Jāmī is deeply embedded in Islamic Sufi ideas which inform and shape the entirety of the text. In retelling and reworking the text, Śrīvara must not only "translate" the Arabic word "love" (*'ishq*)[233] into the appropriate Sanskrit term, but also find equivalences the supporting cosmology and theology in his own Sanskrit (particularly Kashmiri Śiva-worshipping) worldview. More than this, Śrīvara attempts to link Jāmī's *'ishq* with specific Sanskrit aesthetic theories, namely that of *rasa* or poetic savor, in its erotic and in its ultimately salvific guise.

The term *'ishq* then invites a number of possible translations in Sanskrit, and the Sanskrit translation brings along its own connections to texts, ideas, and possibilities contained within the Sanskritic tradition. Śrīvara prefers the term *rāga*, which is often translated into English as "passion" as his general term for the love that binds the *Kathākautuka* together. How then does Persian Sufi-inflected *'ishq* become a Sanskrit Śaiva-oriented *rāga*?

This question of equivalence between tellings lies at the heart of Śrīvara's translational endeavor and must be addressed. In his seminal study of Bengali Muslim texts "In Search of Equivalence: Conceiving Hindu-Muslim Encounter Through Translation Theory," Tony Stewart argues that equivalence "suggests that two conceptual worlds are seen to address similar problems in similar ways without ever proposing that they are identical; to express one in terms of the other—the quintessential metaphoric step—remains an act of translation and not an assertion of identity or some mysterious change of allegiance on the part of the author."[234] At a basic level Stewart's definition of equivalence works rather well for Śrīvara's project in the *Kathākautuka*; Śrīvara constantly attempts to create a Sanskrit world that can accommodate and contain the ideas in Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*.

However, Stewart's study of Bengali cosmological texts is at its core a study of the development of a particular regional form of Islam, and is a pointed rejoinder to theories of pre-modern South Asian religion predicated on ideas of religious syncretism. For Stewart, syncretism "assumes that two distinct entities—in these examples, "Islam" and "Hinduism," as if those were somehow truly monolithic entities—were brought together to form some new construction that shared parts of both but could be classified as neither."[235] In the case of the *Kathākautuka*, however, this definition also seems to hold true, because at least in Śrīvara's mind there are two distinct entities, the text of Mallā Jyāma (Mullā Jāmī) connected to the *yāvanaśāstra* and the Śaiva world of the unaging language of Sanskrit. However, in Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* there exists no hybridity between Hindu and Muslim ideas; no one would mistake this work for either a work of Sufi or Śaiva theology. I propose that the *Kathākautuka* cannot be understood simply in terms of religion or encounter. Rather, these "religious" debates occur in the

---

[233] Writing about translation between two non-modern and non-western languages, the irony of detailing these processes translated into a third language is not lost. While I use the simple word "love" to stand in for Jāmī's *'ishq* and for Śrīvara's *rāga*, the English does not cover the nuances of these terms well.

[234] Tony K. Stewart, "In Search of Equivalence: Conceiving Muslim-Hindu Encounter Through Translation Theory," *History of Religions* 40/3 (2001): 284.

[235] *ibid.*, 270.

elite contexts of the Kashmiri Sultanate court beyond religious equivalences or conversion. Śrīvara's translational audacity in *Kathākautuka* speaks toward the creation of a specific sort of courtly cleverness, one that delights in riddling, ingenuity, and verbal play. In this we see both a celebration of difference and also a denial of the homogenizing impulse of syncretism. In the end, we can begin to trace the career of a different type of Sanskrit, one that is changing with new political and social forces and one that is actively negotiating a new relevance.

To return to Śrīvara's task in translating not just the words of Jāmī but the very fabric of Jāmī's Islamicate worldview, we must return to the idea of "love" and all the difficulties it entails. I focus on two Sanskrit terms, *rāga* and *śṛṅgāra* and Śrīvara's ingenious twisting of Sanskritic and Persianate ideas to create a new sort of text occupying a new sort of place. Following Jāmī's lead, he places love at the very center of the experience of the poem; however, before beginning to translate the Persian verses on ʿishq, Śrīvara provides a fascinating preamble to situate his ʿishq as *rāga* in a Śaiva universe. The *Kathākautuka* creates a parallel cosmogony in which to embed Jāmī's own philosophical and religious framework.

Śrīvara begins his discussion of creation by stepping away from the Persian text and stating his own thesis:

> *nāsti loke param*[236] *kiṃcic cittarāgaṃ vināparam |*
> *tata eva hi vairāgyaṃ jāyate sukhadaṃ punaḥ ||1.50||*

In the world there is nothing excellent except for that ultimate passion in the heart (*cittarāga*).[237] For from that [passion (*rāga*)] alone dispassion (*vi-rāga>vairāgya*) arises, again giving bliss.

In this verse Śrīvara presents in broad strokes his underlying philosophical schema. He provides a translation for ʿishq—here and throughout the *Kathākautuka* he uses the term *rāga*—as well as names the ultimate salvific goal, *vairāgya*, or dispassion. In Śrīvara's translational project, *vairāgya* stands parallel concept to Jāmī's final stage of selfless love, *maḥabbat*. Śrīvara's schema will be enlivened by parallels to Tantric Śaiva cosmology but here it must be stressed that for Śrīvara, the ultimate goal is *vairāgya*, or dispassion, which is the necessary precursor to spiritual liberation. This word is especially important in Kashmir following the teachings of the *Mokṣopāya*, a Kashmiri text teaching liberation to the warrior class (the *Mokṣopāya* gained great fame outside of

---

[236] K 'param. Accepting this reading gives much the same sense: "In this world there is nothing unsurpassable…"

[237] Here and throughout I translate the words *citta* and its synonyms as "heart" to provide a parallel to Jāmī's key Persian term *dil*. Such a translation as opposed to the usual "mind" is justified by the Sanskrit lexicographical tradition, see for instance *Amarakośa* 1.4.315: *cittaṃ tu ceto hṛdayaṃ svāntaṃ hṛn mānasaṃ manaḥ.* I would like to thank Thibaut d'Hubert for pointing out Śrīvara's translation of *dil* and the *Amarakośa* reference.

the Valley as the *Yogavāśiṣṭha* and related texts.[238] These *Mokṣopāya*-related texts remained quite popular in Muslim courts, garnering several translations into Persian[239]). An episode in Śrīvara's Sanskrit history of Sultanate Kashmir shows Śrīvara himself teaching the *Mokṣopāya* to Sultān Zayn, underlining the importance of this text and its underlying philosophy in the Sultanate court.[240] As the introduction to the *Kathākautuka* will show, the *Mokṣopāya*'s central concept of *vairāgya*[241] is essential not only to Śrīvara's historical imagination but also to his telling of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*.

Given Śrīvara's deep concern for the concept of *vairāgya*, he must explain how the *rāga* of the *Kathākautuka* as a translation of the *ʿishq* of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* first into his understanding. We see in the preceding verses that Śrīvara resorts to a clever verbal play here, drawing on the derivation of the term *vairāgya* from *vi-* meaning without and *rāga* passion, which is made into the abstract noun *vairāgya*. He first states that there is nothing except for (*vinā*) the passion of *rāga*. The first half of the verse gives the necessary building blocks which can be transformed into dispassion, indeed, even grammatically there is no dispassion without passion. This *rāga-vairāgya* relationship provides the philosophical and soteriological core of Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* and will animate the text on every level.

Such ingenious displays continue throughout the creation of Śrīvara's parallel cosmology, requiring sometimes reading radical equivalences into Sanskrit literary history to provide the conceptual space for a creative retelling of the Persian. Here I provide a reading of Śrīvara's account of Jāmī's account of creation. I have abridged the text, but the flow of his account should be read as an argument. The main ingredients in Śrīvara's account are the *rāga/vairāgya* relationship and a Tantric Śaiva cosmology, in which the great god Śiva emanates and manifests the world. Tantric Śaivism provides a vocabulary and Śrīvara resorts to its somewhat technical lexicon of concepts, all in the service of linking *ʿishq/rāga* to an accepted Śaiva worldview. In his introduction of the concept of *ʿishq*, Śrīvara shows the centrality of *ʿishq/rāga* in three separate but interconnected instances. The first account is largely "mythological" in that it concentrates on the god Śiva creating the world. The second is more "theological" since it tries to align *rāga* with specifically Śaiva theologies. In the third, Śrīvara returns to a close translation of the Persian, his telling enlivened and deepened by the previous accounts.

---

[238] The *Mokṣopāya* is the subject of an ongoing research project under the direction of Walter Slaje at the Martin-Luther Universität in Halle an der Saale. For the textual history, diffusion, and reception of this important text, see Walter Slaje, *Vom Mokṣopāya-Śāstra zum Yogavāśiṣṭha-Mahārāmayaṇa* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994).

[239] The Persian *Jog Bashisht* and its Sanskrit source(s) has received more attention recently. Heike Franke provides an overview of the source's transmission into Persian in "Die persischen Übersetzungen des *Laghuyogavāśiṣṭha*," in *The Mokṣopāya, Yogavāsiṣṭha and Related Texts*, ed. Jürgen Hanneder (Aachen: Shaker, 2005), 113–29.

[240] See Obrock, "History at the End of History," esp. 228–30.

[241] For an outline of *vairāgya* in the *Mokṣopāya*, see Slaje, "Liberation from Intentionality and Involvement: On the Concept of the *Jīvan-mukti* in the *Mokṣopāya*," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28 (2000): 171–94.

The *Kathākautuka*'s account of creation begins in the following verse:
cittāśaktivaśenaiva sa svayaṃ bhagavāñ śivaḥ[242] |
śaktyaiva saha saṅgamya[243] *sarvam etad avāsṛjat ||1.51||*

The Lord Śiva himself created all of this through the power inherent in the
mind having come together with the Goddess Śakti/power.

Here Śrīvara provides an overview for his entire account of creation to come. The verse
highlights two key elements: the primacy of Śiva and the importance of Śakti. We will
see later in the account how he integrates this into a cosmogony animated by *rāga*, this
verse introduces the key term *śakti*, which can either mean the dynamic power that allows
creation to go forward or Śakti as the proper name of Śiva's consort.

The following verse backtracks to the beginning of the process of creation.
Śrīvara here depicts the oneness and aloneness of the great God Śiva before the process
of creation begins. He writes:

dvitvahīne 'py anideśye jagannāmavivarjite |
kaivalye kevalaṃ tasminn āsīd eko maheśvaraḥ ||1.52||

In that solitude (*kaivalya*) even being devoid of duality, non-discriminated
(*anideśya*), devoid of the name "world" there was only Maheśvara.[244]

With echoes of the great cosmogonic works like the *Nāsadīya* (Ṛg Veda 10.129),
Śrīvara starts at the beginning, although for him the existence of Śiva is taken as the
starting point. From this absolute unity and aloneness (*kaivālya*) how does creation
occur? Śrīvara continues in the following verses:

nānārūpamayaṃ divyaṃ sarvalāvaṇyasaṃyutam |
anekakautukākīrṇam anavadyam anaśvaram ||1.53||
paśyann evātmanātmānaṃ svadhāmādarśamaṇḍale[245] |
samaye 'smin sa deveśo babhūvānandanirbharaḥ ||1.54||
kasmaicid darśayāmy etad yāvac cintānvitaḥ śivaḥ |
tāvad icchā samutpannā prādurbhūtāsya mohinī ||1.55||

Seeing his own self through his self—made of various forms, divine,
endowed with every beauty, overstrewn with many wonders, faultless
(*anavadya*), indestructible—in the mirror of his own splendor (*dhāman*),
at that moment the lord of gods became a mass of bliss (*ānandanirbhara*).
As Śiva became occupied [with the thought]: "I should show this to
someone," then *icchā* (desire/volition) arose, which became manifest for

---

[242] K *bhagavañ chivaḥ*.
[243] Em. LO; S, K *saṅgasya*. The *akṣara*-s *ma* and *sa* are often confused in the Śāradā
script. I would like to thank Dr. Whitney Cox for this suggestion.
[244] Although *maheśvara* simply means "great God", this is simply a name of Śiva.
[245] K *sudhāmādarśamaṇḍale*.

him as beguiling woman (*mohinī*).

This account of creation shows that the unitary singleness of Śiva is instigated toward proliferation. Śiva's awareness of himself makes a desire to reveal himself arise. This desire (here called *icchā*, a technical term that will be discussed in greater detail later) then seems to become physically manifest as a beautiful woman. The emanation can thus begin. In these verses we have all the ingredients necessary for creation, yet at this moment Śrīvara stops, and two verses later, seems to begin his cosmogony again.

The second account of creation is largely parallel to the first, except the connections between Śiva, *rāga*, and creation are expanded by tying them to specific theological concepts. The terms *śakti* and *icchā* appear again but in a slightly different way. Śrīvara begins the account of creation again, with the insertion of the term *rāga*, which for him stands in for ʿ*ishq*. He writes

icchāśaktyātha saṃgamya[246] *rāgeṇāpy*[247] *āśritāśrayaḥ |*
sa hi devo mahādevaḥ tanmayaṃ vyasṛjaj jagat ||1.58||

And so that very God Mahādeva whose heart was occupied by passion
too, united with the power (*śakti*) of desire (*icchā*) and created the world
which consists of that.

In this verse, as in the previous one, we see that Śrīvara brings the term *rāga* (his translational equivalent for the Persian ʿ*ishq*) into a different conceptual space. He seeks to align ʿ*ishq* as *rāga* with certain Tantric cosmologies. The first line provides two conditions for the creation of the world: first Śiva unites with his[248] power of volition (*icchā*) and second his heart or mind as the locus of sensory perception (*āśraya*) is resorted to (*āśrita*) by *rāga*. Once these conditions are met, God can create (or emanate, *vi*+√*sṛj*) the world.

In the *Kathākautuka*'s cosmogony, Śrīvara ties *rāga* to the orthodox notion of the *tattva*s, or the basic building blocks of the world. In Śaiva cosmologies, *icchā* or volition refers to Śiva's will, the first force that allows for the emanation of the world. Following the *Kiraṇatantra,* the *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* states: "*icchā* designates the will of God, that is considered as his sole instrument."[249] The compound *icchāśakti* takes this concept further; *icchāśakti* is the first of the three powers though which Śiva manifests the universe. Śrīvara begins creation in a way that is completely understandable within a specifically Kashmiri Śaiva Tantric cosmology, by invoking the first power through

---

[246] Em. LO; S, K *saṅgasya*.

[247] S *rāgiṇāpy*.

[248] It is important to note that this is *Śiva's* power of volition. According to the monistic Śaivism espoused by Śrīvara, the *śakti*s are his alone and have no independent existence, compare verse 1.52 quoted above. I would like to thank Walter Slaje for pointing this out to me.

[249] *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa*, 213. The Sanskrit passage from the *Kiraṇa* runs: *icchaiva karaṇaṃ tasya yathā sadyogiṇo matā.* "*Icchā* alone is his instrument (*karaṇa*), so think true *yogin*s."

which God manifests the world. How then does this line up with his second condition, the one that contains the all-important term *rāga*, a term which, although not unknown in Tantric writings never assumes the same cosmological significance as *icchā*?

I think that for Śrīvara the two conditions shown in the first half of verse 58 are not separate, but rather parallel. In this way Śrīvara unites Jāmī's key concept of ʿishq to the Śaiva concept of *icchā*. *Rāga* then acts as a bridge mediating and negotiating these ideas in this new Sanskrit telling. We see both the power of volition (*icchāśakti*) and passion (*rāga*) used in the instrumental case after a verbal element meaning something like coming together (*sam+√gam*)[250] or pervading (*ā+√śri*), allowing the reader to draw parallels between the two concepts. The dense interbraiding of Śrīvara's account allows a layering of different ideas (both Sufi and Śaiva) and terms (both in Sanskrit and their unspoken Arabo-Persian homologies). Though their audacious constellation of these concepts, Jāmī's ʿishq can become a fundamental and dynamic part of Śrīvara's Śiva-centered Tantric cosmology.

The next verses continue this Tantric emanationist cosmogony. After the introduction of *rāga*, the process of the creation of the world continues, now in terms of *rāga* rather than *icchā*:

> *vidhāya vividhāṃ sṛṣṭiṃ svakīyāṃśayutāṃ tataḥ |*
> *kurvan rāgamayīṃ līlāṃ vibhāty asyāṃ svayaṃ vibhuḥ ||1.59||*
> *tenecchayā jagat sarvaṃ racitaṃ yac carācaram |*
> *rāgeṇāpi na taj jātu virāgaṃ jāyate kvacit ||1.60||*

> He then made the variegated creation, all connected to a part of him (*svakīyāṃśayutām*) and the Lord, making this divine game (*līlā*) which consists of passion (*rāga*), shone forth in it. By him the entire universe was created through his desire, what is moving and what is fixed [was created] by passion too. And because of [that] passion, the world will never at any time become dispassionate (*virāga*).

These verses show the shift to an entirely *rāga*-based cosmology. *Rāga* here expands to become the animating principle for the act of creation. Śrīvara depicts Śiva's divine play of emanating the world of *saṃsāra* as ultimately permeated by *rāga*. This passion cannot be extricated from the world given that the cause is materially identical with its effect. Since the *icchā* of Śiva produces the world, everything that exists can but not be permeated by *rāga*.

This centering of *rāga* and this shift in terminology is essential to re-link Śrīvara's Śaiva frame to Jāmī's own introduction to the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*. For Śrīvara, *rāga* is the force that underlies and binds the existence of everything in the universe. While *rāga* is common in Brahmanical and Buddhist philosophies as one of defilements that cause *saṃsāra* (*kleśa*), Śrīvara's radical broadening of its range of meaning is necessary to link the Śaiva worldview to the Sufi ideas underlying the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*. Śrīvara provides an illustration for the broadened role of the *rāga* in verse 64:

---

[250] The term *sam+√gam* resonates with the previous more sexualized account in verse 51 discussed above. This layering is no accident.

dṛṣṭvaivācetanaṃ baddharāgaṃ gharmarucāmbujam |
sudhāṃśunā ca kumudaṃ tatsiktāḥ kiṃ na mānavāḥ ||1.64||

As soon as one sees that insentient lotus is bound by love for the light of
light of the sun, and the [insentient] water-lily [is bound by love] for the
moon, would not humans not [also] be drenched in it [=love]?

Here Śrīvara asserts that pervasive force which binds things together is nothing but *rāga*.
In more orthodox Śaiva accounts, this underlying animating and unifying force would not
be termed as such (nor even be governed by *icchā* as *rāga*'s homologue). However in the
Kathākautuka's account, after anchoring *ʿishq* as *rāga* in a specific Tantric understanding
of the cosmos, *rāga* can assume an all-pervading importance.

　　Śrīvara's vision of the world permeated by *rāga* can now come into conversation
with Jāmī's own Sufi cosmology animated by *ʿishq*. After his long digression from the
Persian text of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*, Śrīvara returns to a close translation of Jāmī's
words which are now able to be enlivened by the connections to Śaiva contents. A side-
by-side comparison of Śrīvara's Sanskrit text to the Persian shows the Śiva-centered
Tantric cosmology was a preamble to a careful translation of Jāmī's use of *ʿishq*. In his
Yūsuf va Zulaykhā, Jāmī writes:

　　dilī fārigh zi dard-i ʿishq, dil nīst
　　tan bī dard-i dil juz āb u gil nīst

　　A heart free of love's pain is no heart
　　A body without the heart's pain is nothing but clay and water.[251]

　　Here Jāmī presents *ʿishq* as a being the driving force causing pain and agitation in
the human heart. In verse 67 of the *Kathākautuka*, Śrīvara transforms Jāmī's Persian
quite literally, but with a few interesting changes. Purely formally, Śrīvara must fill out
the original Persian to fit the longer thirty-two-syllable Sanskrit *śloka* meter.

　　yadi cittaṃ bhaved rāga[252]*vyathāhīnaṃ na tan manaḥ |*
　　tanus tatpīḍayā tyaktā[253] *na sā mṛdvāriṇā*[254] *vinā ||1.67||*

---

[251] The Persian verses quoted here were translated by Prashant Keshavmurthy. I would
like to thank Dr. Keshavmurthy for reviewing the Persian text of these verses with me.
[252] K *rāśa*(?). The characters *śa* and *ga* are easily confused in the Śāradā script, so much
so that it has become almost proverbial.
[253] Em. LO; K *vyaktā*, S *tyaktvā*. This verse is difficult to construe. Schmidt's reading of
tyaktvā is difficult because one would expect an accusative object, not the instrumental.
Parab's reading of *vyaktā* is possible, but in this case the emendation *tyaktā* suggests
itself as highly likely. Such an emendation would produce a reading which could be
construed as broadly parallel with the first line *tanus tatpīḍayā tyaktā na sā mṛd vāriṇā*
vinā "a body abandoned by the pain of it is not [a body, it is] clay without water." This

131

If a heart (*cittam*) might exist devoid of agitation by passion, then that is not a heart (*manaḥ*). A body abandoned by the pain of it [i.e. passion]. It is nothing but clay and water.

The translation is quite close; Śrīvara as usual transforms the heart (*dil*) of the Persian into Sanskrit words dealing with the mind and mental processes (*citta*, *manas*). The second line is an almost verbatim translation of the Persian, although the Sanskrit is at times difficult to construe. However, when read together with Jāmī's original, it is clear that Śrīvara followed the Persian closely—he even uses the cognate *tanuḥ* for Jāmī's *tan*.[255] The crucial element here is Śrīvara's use of *rāga* which has been given its bearing by the previous verses; rooted in its Śaiva context and explained as the animating and binding force of the world, Jāmī's verses can begin to make sense in Sanskrit.

In the following verse Jāmī continues on the theme of the pain that comes from ʿishq, and how to transform this worldly, painful love into transcendent happiness. He writes:

> *zi ʿālam rūy āvar dar gham-i ʿishq*
> *ki bāshad ʿālamī khush ʿālam-i ʿishq*

Turn your face from the world to love's grief
For a happy world is the world of love.

Again, Śrīvara expands on the ideas in Jāmī's Persian. The *Kathākautuka*'s version reads:

> *vivṛtya vadanaṃ lokāt tatrārpaya mukhaṃ mudā |*
> *saṃyojanādhikaḥ prokto rāgo harṣāya rāgiṇām ||1.68||*

Turn your face from the world! Joyfully fix your sight (=lit. face) on that [passion]! *Rāga* for those possessed of *rāga* (*rāgin*s)*,* proclaimed as that which surpasses [even] sexual pleasure (*saṃyojanādhika*),[256] causes joy.

Again, the Sanskrit verse comes very close to the Persian in meaning while taking

---

reading, while elliptical, is plausible. A careful comparison of both the manuscript evidence and Śrīvara's translational strategies is necessary.
[254] S *mṛddhāriṇā*.
[255] I would like to thank Thibaut d'Hubert for his insightful comments on construing and understanding this verse. He pointed out both the extreme literalness of his translation as well as Śrīvara's clear use the cognate Sanskrit *tanuḥ* for Persian *tan*.
[256] Following a suggestion by Walter Slaje, I translate the word *saṃyojanādhika* as "surpassing (*adhika*) sexual pleasure (*saṃyojana*)." However there seems to be some idea underlying the term meaning "binding together," suggesting the meaning of "surpassing [even] the binding together," perhaps even the binding together of the world of *saṃsāra*. Again, it is possible that Śrīvara intended both valences.

a different rhetorical path. In the Sanskrit there is no reference to grief (Persian *gham*) since the use of the Sanskrit word *loka* ("the mundane world") is wide enough to conjure ideas of *saṃsāra,* the unsatisfactory realm of transmigration. Where Jāmī paradoxically juxtaposes "love's grief" (*gham-i ʿishq*) to "a happy world" (*ʿalamī khush*), for Śrīvara once one turns away from the world one realizes the basic truth of *rāga* as the unifying and underlying force of the world.

This idea is continued in the following verse. Jāmī writes:

gham-i ʿishq az dil-i kas kam mabādā
dil bī ʿishq dar ʿālam mabādā

May no one's heart want in love's grief
May no loveless heart exist in the world.

Jāmī strongly emphasizes the paradox of love's grief and love: where love is the cause of suffering it is also what one should turn to look towards for liberation from that pain. Śrīvara translates this as:

taccintā hṛdi sarveṣāṃ nyūnā mā bhūt kadācana |
mano manasvināṃ tena vihīnam api jātu cit ||1.69||

May the worry about it (*taccintā*) never at any time wane in the hearts of
the entire world! [May] the minds of the wise never [be] deprived of it!

Here, Śrīvara shifts Jāmī's term *gham* to the Sanskrit word *cintā*. No longer is it centrally about pain, suffering, or sadness, but rather care, worry, or anxious thought. While the Persian term can have these valences as well, the *Kathākautuka* here highlights the mental cogitative aspects. In the three Sanskrit verses, Śrīvara modulates his translation of *gham* from *vyathā* to *pīḍā* in the first verse, leaving it out entirely in the second, and *cintā* in the third. It seems to me that after setting up *rāga* as a basic force of the universe Śrīvara is able to begin to place Jāmī's original, but the ideas of *gham* and *gham-i ʿishq* are unable to be fully realized within this system. Notice that while for Śrīvara *ʿishq* keeps a single unified translation throughout, *gham* is translated variously and not entirely consistently. Śrīvara's system allows *rāga* act as binding and pervasive force, but Śrīvara is unable to systematically integrate the concept of *gham* in the same way. Perhaps because the idea that the world (as *saṃsāra*) is unsatisfactory is so deeply engrained in Sanskrit literature that *gham* becomes unnecessary (or even redundant). A reading of these verses shows what is important for Śrīvara, but we may well ask ourselves why some concepts are given so much room to grow and breathe while others are marginalized.

To answer this question we must return to Śrīvara's larger theoretical framing of the *Kathākautuka*. These three verses show both how closely Śrīvara read the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*, yet this reading is constrained by Śrīvara's own worldview which demands that *vairāgya*, dispassion for the world, supersede *rāga*. This reading of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* is very much Śrīvara's creation and would not be possible without the work put in to providing a cosmological backdrop for his telling. Enlivened by its resonance with

the key soteriological concept of *vairāgya* or dispassion, once Śrīvara ties *rāga* to the tantric cosmogonical principle of *icchā*, he is able to triangulate between these theological pulls. He presents a Sanskrit version of ʿishq which can operate in consort with canons of Sanskritic thought while opening a space for his own telling to move beyond Persianate and Islamicate expectations. Śrīvara opens this space to provide the bases for the conceptual vocabulary that will make his translation possible. In the end, he parallels Jāmī's movement from the passionate love of ʿishq to the selfless love of *maḥabbat* by detailing the transmutation of *rāga* into *vairāgya*.[257] The *Kathākautuka* is self-aware in its originality, conscious of both Sanskritic and Persianate canons but moving outside of both.

I turn to the Sanskrit literary theoretical concepts Śrīvara deploys and their connections both to Jāmī's text and to the overarching narrative design of the *Kathākautuka*. Until this point this essay has concentrated on cosmological and theological aspects of love/ʿishq/*rāga*. However, *rāga* is not the only way "love" is translated and nor is tantric cosmogony the only source for Śrīvara's textual imagination. Śrīvara not only frames his translation theologically through an investigation of love's cosmogonic function but also literarily through the canons of Sanskrit aesthetic criticism. The literary structure of *Kathākautuka* depends on *rasa*, or poetic savor, particularly *śṛṅgāra rasa*, the aesthetic experience of erotic love, and *śānta rasa*, or the aesthetic experience of the cessation of desires.

For Sanskrit authors, *śṛṅgāra rasa* is based on the lived experience of passionate love (*rati*), while *śānta rasa* is based on the lived experience of world-weariness (*nirveda*). Through a process of imaginative cultivation, a work of literature transforms a worldly emotion (for instance passionate love) into an emotion that can be savored in the self-contained universe of the aesthetic experience. In this way, the basic human emotion of passion can be felt as *śṛṅgāra rasa*, dependent upon nothing but the work of art itself. For Śrīvara the concept of *rasa* is essential for the construction and conceptualization of the *Kathākautuka*.[258]

For the Kashmiri aesthetic theoreticians, there are nine basic human emotions, and nine corresponding *rasa*s. As previously stated, the first is *rati* "passion" which manifests as *śṛṅgāra rasa* when engendered by a literary work, and the ninth and last is *nirveda* which is felt by a poetic connoisseur as *śānta rasa*.[259] Of the nine *rasa*s Śrīvara

---

[257] Jāmī's construction follows Ibn ʿArabī's movement from active ʿishq to selfless *maḥabbat* and Śrīvara himself parallels this in his movement from *rāga* to *vairāgya*. The story of Baghiza (Sanskrit Deyā) provides an interesting example of this; in Śrīvara's telling she moves from the state of active passionate love (*rāga*) to the *vairāgya* of a Śaiva ascetic, see Obrock "Muslim *Mahākāvyas*." I would like to thank Thibaut d'Hubert for his helpful insights into Jāmī's use of Ibn ʿArabī's categories and their relation to Śrīvara's own schema.

[258] This schema was theorized in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* tradition, and reached its mature form in Kashmir five centuries earlier by Ānandavardhana (fl. ca. 950) and his commentator Abhinavagupta (fl. ca. 1000).

[259] Earlier theoretical accounts do not include *śānta rasa*. However, the Kashmiri theoreticians who Śrīvara follows accept *śānta rasa*. Abhinavagupta gives it special

only mentions the first and the last. From this basic outline, we can see these two aesthetic concepts map rather well onto the two poles of Śrīvara's theology: *rāga* equates with *śṛṅgāra rasa* while *vairāgya* equates with *śānta rasa*. In this way, the underlying theological premises created through Śrīvara's innovative reading of Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*, the *Mokṣopāya*, and the Śaiva tantric corpus can be brought within a rubric of aesthetic expectations laid out in Sanskrit (especially Kashmiri Sanskrit) literary theory.

Through this basic insight, the *Kathākautuka*'s underlying architecture becomes clearer. Here Śrīvara's concept of ʿishq as *rāga* meets the aesthetic canons of *rasa* theory to provide the literary shape for the entirety of the text. The text moves from a celebration of *rāga* as ʿishq marked by the experience of *śṛṅgāra* and ends on *vairāgya* which is equated to spiritual liberation marked by the experience of *śānta*. Yet how does he link this to the Persian text and Sufi imagination of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*? Śrīvara justifies this literary and philosophical intervention in verses 14 and 15 of his introductory chapter. He writes:

> *kiṃ tu pūrvam apūrvaṃ yat paraṃ yoganirūpaṇam |*
> *kṛtaṃ manīṣayā tena tad ante kathyate mayā ||1.14||*
> *sarvatrāyaṃ kramaḥ pūrvaṃ śṛṅgārarasasaṃyutām |*
> *abhidāya kathāṃ pūrvaiḥ śānto 'nte parikīrtitaḥ ||1.15||*

> But the new (*apūrva*) and extraordinary (*para*) description of contemplation (*yoganirūpaṇa*) which was placed by Jāmī in his wisdom at the beginning (*pūrva*), I put at the end. This is the order [of text] in all cases: First previous authorities speak of a story which is marked by *śṛṅgāra rasa* and they announce *śānta rasa* at the end.[260]

These two enigmatic verses point to another reimagination of "love" as the emotional core of his textual world. Śrīvara has two interconnected aims in the two verses: the first makes an argument about the *Kathākautuka*'s structure and the second implicitly deals with untranslatable religious elements of in the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*. In the first, he appeals to an established tradition of previous authorities (in the Sanskrit simply *pūrvaiḥ*, "those who have come before"), tacitly arguing that his text moves within a certain set of expectations. To my knowledge, there is no place in the theoretical literature that argues for this *śṛṅgāra* to *śānta* progression within the context of a single work. Here Śrīvara seems to extrapolate from the order of the Kashmiri aesthetic theoretical where *śṛṅgāra* is the first *rasa* to be discussed and *śānta* stands as the last. In the context of an entire work, he presents his own innovative reading of both Sanskrit tradition and Jāmī's trajectory from ʿishq to *maḥabbat*.

This brings us to the second point of these two verses. What does he mean by that part of the text that Jāmī put at the beginning in his *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*? Contextually it is clear that Śrīvara refers circuitously to the Persian poem's *bismillah*, the praise of God which should occur at this place of the text. For all of Śrīvara's claims to follow Jāmī's

---

importance in his own system. For the controversy over *śānta* see V. Raghavan, *The Number of Rasas* (Madras: Adyar Library, 1940), esp. chap. 1-3.

[260] Again, I would like to thank Walter Slaje for his help in understanding these verses.

text in strict succession, he constantly reworks the text from its very ideological foundations and literary structure. In these verses, he points out that while there is no praise of God at this point, the *Kathākautuka* itself ends with a thirty-four-verse praise poem to Śiva which takes its place. In this way, by an innovative reading of Sanskrit aesthetic theory Śrīvara is able to find a place for the *bismillah*, as a hymn of praise in an ecstatic and devotional mode that caps of the entire poem. The *rasa* of this is not given as *śṛṅgāra* precisely because of the larger theoretical model that underlies his translational methodology: one must move from *rāga* to *vairāgya*.[261]

7.5 Conclusion: Religion, Aesthetics, and Difference in Sultanate Kashmir

The awareness of both Persian and Sanskrit literary and religious norms shapes the entirety of the *Kathākautuka*. Yet while Śrīvara explicitly acknowledges Persian genre expectations, he concously and openly transforms the text to conform with Sanskritic canons of thought. Toward the beginning of the work, he moves the expected Persian introductory praise of God to the end of the entire text. This allows the beginning of the *Kathākautuka* to focus purely on the passionate love felt by Zulaykhā/Jolekhā for Yūsuf/Yosobha. This also explains Śrīvara's choice to introduce the princess Jolekhā first in his Sanskrit tale rather than Yosobha, since the passionate love felt by Jolekhā centered on Yosobha.[262] Such an arrangement of his reading of Sanskrit aesthetic theory will be a tale marked by *śṛṅgāra rasa*.

He shapes the *Kathākautuka* through another set of expectations defined by his own incorporation of *rasa* philosophy. Notice that his reordering of the text begins with *śṛṅgāra* or the erotic and ends with *śānta* or the peaceful. By alerting the reader to this progression, Śrīvara again makes an argument for his understanding of "love". The connection of a romance with the *śṛṅgāra rasa* is fully understandable, but why does this story not begin and end in this mode?

---

[261] This point is driven home in the first verse of chapter fifteen of the *Kathākautuka*, which parallels verse 1.15 quoted above. Śrīvara writes:

abhidhāya kathām etāṃ śṛṅgāradvirasāṅkitām |
adhunā vakṣyate śānto lokadvayahitāvahaḥ ||15.1||

Having stated this story (*kathā*) that is marked with *śṛṅgāra* as one of two *rasas*, [I] will now state *śānta rasa* which brings benefit (*hita*) to the two worlds.

[262] This basic feature of Sanskrit literature has been little remarked upon, but Sanskrit "romantic" texts move from the experiencer of love to the experienced object of love. For example, in Kalidāsa's famed drama, the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, the hero of the tale, Duṣyanta is introduced first as the subject of desire, while Śakuntalā is conceptualized secondarily as the object of desire. A similar pattern occurs in the *Kathākautuka*, in which the reader first encounters Jolekhā, and hears of the mysterious stranger who haunts her dreams as the object of her desire. Only later does the reader hear the tale of Yosobha. In an interesting inversion of Sanskritic gender roles he remains the object of desire.

In the end, Śrīvara's surprising adaptation of the Sanskrit literary-theoretical concept of *rasa* further underlines his basic cosmological, theological, and philosophical understanding of the world. Just as an understanding of and deep engagement with *rāga* is necessary before one can move into the desired end of *vairāgya*, so too the literary text moves from the erotic *śṛṅgāra rasa* to the aesthetic experience of detachment from the world in *śānta rasa*. Again Śrīvara's translation is a deep transformation, structurally reworking Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* into what he sees as a cohesive whole. It must be stressed however that Śrīvara's particular imagination remains just that—a particular imagination. His work is strikingly original in terms of both his treatment of the Persian sources and actual Sanskrit composition. While he draws upon earlier Kashmiri *kathā* literature, Śaiva theology and cosmogony, and traditional *rasa*-based aesthetic criticism, Śrīvara's composition places these concepts in a new constellation in which each component is enlivened by its surprising juxtaposition with the others and deepened by their implicit conversation with the Persian text itself in conversation with its own literary and theological influences.

This stunning thought world in which the *Kathākautuka* operates must negotiate a space of relevance between two sets of *śāstra*s. As the story progresses, new problems and new equivalences begin to arise from large issues of theology. For example, how should specifically Islamicate concepts such as Prophethood be understood within Sanskrit? How is beauty to be expressed within Indic literary registers? Even the small details of *realia* require transformation, so that the ladies of Egypt are cutting cucumbers when they see Yūsuf for the first time![263] Each negotiation requires careful planning to make sure it makes sense in Sanskrit; the translation must walk a thin line between staying true to the original text and staying true to Sanskrit expectations. In such a way, the world of the *Kathākautuka* is a world cognizant of both Persian and Sanskrit canons but circumscribed by neither. In the end this points not to the religiosity of the text or its interpretation being central to Śrīvara's translational project, but rather the complex interplay between textualized sets of expectations.

In this way Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* is not "cosmopolitan" since, although written in the classical (or classicizing) "Language of the Gods," the *Kathākautuka* cannot be totally confined within or explained by the Sanskrit canon, nor was it ever expected to travel out of the court of Moḥammad Shāh. Nor was it an "encounter" because, through winks and nods, Śrīvara shows a deep engagement with both Sanskrit and Persian literary expectations. This sort of attitude presupposes an audience that would be familiar with both Sanskritic and Persianate worldviews, and could find delight in Śrīvara's own navigation of the space between *śāstra*s. Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* shows a deep and surprising engagement with Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*. Śrīvara is quite forthright about his own qualms, emendations, and reimaginings. Realizing that Jāmī's words were written under the constraints of a different intellectual canon (*śāstra*), he takes pains to put the *Kathākautuka* in conversation with his own set of traditions. A careful and sympathetic reading of Śrīvara's own telling of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* can help us begin to conceptualize the creative ferment of the Sultanate period in the elite sphere of the Kashmiri court. While the movement of Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* both historically and spatially from Timurid Herat to Sultanate Kashmir maps the mechanics of circulation

---

[263] Sanskrit *urvāruka*. See *Kathākautuka* 13.46-50.

between Central and South Asia, the reception of the text within the court of Moḥammad Shāh shows the complicated dynamics of textual reception in pre-Mughal elite culture. Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* does not aim to comprehend the original but rather, through historically situated translation strategies, transforms the very foundation of reading and interpreting the story in a different literary world. A reading of Śrīvara's text shows that neither a literal translation for understanding a new and strange "other" nor a religiously motivated project of polemic or syncretic accommodation underlies the creation of the *Kathākautuka*. Rather the work expects an audience knowledgeable about the Persian original and its underlying presuppositions as well as the Sanskrit ideas Śrīvara uses and plays with. Śrīvara's final result stands an expression of an already intertwined court culture in which Persian and Sanskrit constantly sought new ways of being relevant.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1. A Different Vernacularization

The previous chapters presented snapshots of the dynamic career of two intertwined literary genres in Kashmir, the *ślokakathā* and the *rājataraṅgiṇī*, between the mid-eleventh and early sixteenth centuries. I argued that these genres demonstrate not only the development of new stylistic registers but also new modes of expressing, accommodating, and adapting ideas both from within and from outside the confines of the Valley. In such a way, reading the work of Somadeva and Kalhaṇa alongside their later Sultanate-era followers Jonarāja and Śrīvara provides a history for particularly Kashmiri way of writing and thinking in Sanskrit. More than just a diachronic exploration of these genres as they move through history, this dissertation provided a synchronic picture of the contexts in which authors resorted to this Sanskrit mode of writing, and how changing literary, political, and social environments affected these genres.

Beginning with the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, I traced the development of the Kashmiri historical sensibility. Somadeva's work served as an ideal starting place since it allows for and expects the adaptation and assimilation of sources from different times and places into a localizably Kashmiri form. While Somadeva stands in a long tradition of Kashmiri "translational" texts such as Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and the epitomes of Kṣemendra, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* represents the most mature and self-aware iteration of the *ślokakathā* genre, constantly echoed in later works from Kalhaṇa to Śrīvara. In the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Kalhaṇa extends the logic of Somadeva's mature *ślokakathā* form and creates a way of transforming the raw stuff of history—for him purāṇic legends, inscriptional records, and previous chronicles—into a Kashmiri literary history. Both Somadeva and Kalhaṇa present works which sit uncomfortably in the received canons of Sanskrit textual classification, at once nodding toward aesthetic theoretical organizing concepts such as *kāvya* and *rasa* while tacitly subsuming their importance to a different literary vision. This vision is never fully theorized either for the *ślokakathā* or the *rājataraṅgiṇī*, yet in these genres and in Somadeva and Kalhaṇa's articulations, a powerful mode of regional articulation came into being.

For Jonarāja and Śrīvara, both situated temporally further into the vernacular millennium, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* became touchstones for describing the new state of things in the Sultanate period. Somadeva and Kalhaṇa's regional forms perfected three centuries earlier provide a language to articulate new sorts of religion, society, and polity. Jonarāja, while still very much imbricated within the world of *kāvya* and commentaries, revived the *rājataraṅgiṇī* and in doing so attempted to provide a history for the Kashmiri Sultanate. Jonarāja's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* is also an argument, placing new religious groups and social relations in his own vision of a just society; thus Jonarāja shows Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn ensuring the balance between different communities and religious worldviews (*darśanas*) in opposition to Sūha Bhaṭṭa's persecutions under the reign of Sikandar Shāh. However, in the end Jonarāja's vision is never fully realized and his own *Rājataraṅgiṇī* remained incomplete. Śrīvara continued Jonarāja's work but ultimately transcended his teacher and mentor's model. Śrīvara for his part rearranges the life story of Zayn to balance out the narrative needs of

presenting kingship while still adhering to the aesthetic vision of the *rājataraṅgiṇī*. Śrīvara takes on a non-linear approach to history in order to provide an account of the past that conforms to Kalhaṇa's aesthetic sensibilities while changing to fit a patron-centered Sultanate model. Śrīvara manages to create something quite different from both Kalhaṇa and Jonarāja's works while still using the basic framework of the *rājataraṅgiṇī*'s vision. It is clear that Śrīvara was deeply impressed by the works of his predecessors, even returning to the *Kathāsaritsāgara* as a model for his translation of the *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* into Sanskrit verse.

The relationship between these texts shows the development of a way of thinking about history and historicity in the Valley from the eleventh to the early sixteenth century. As a conclusion, I here point out a few ways these localized Kashmiri texts can contribute to larger conversations about Sanskrit literary and intellectual history as it moves away from its remote classical past and enters into the fractious world of the second millennium. As testaments to the shifting landscape of Sanskrit and its uses in medieval South Asia, the works of these four authors speak directly to debates on the end of the "Sanskrit cosmopolis" and the attendant processes of regionalization and vernacularization. Here I speak of "vernacularization" not in terms of specific "popular" languages, but the use of specific regional languages, informed by their connections to past cosmopolitan traditions. Here this sort of vernacularization takes place in Sanskrit, as previous works, ideas, and sources were adapted to fit a certain regionalized elite idiom.

The works of Kalhaṇa and Somadeva provide the basis for this argument; the *ślokakathā* and the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genres in Kashmir appear broadly at the same time as other vernacularizing experiments in South Asia. Further, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* demonstrate a particularly Kashmiri way of transforming sources that is very much part of a Kashmiri literary moment, not a cosmopolitan or larger Indic model. Rather these texts almost seem to translate "cosmopolitan" texts and traditions into particularly localizable genres. Attention to these texts' readings of the past tradition and their new horizons of literary production point to a self-conscious Kashmiri literature. After the breakdown of the Second Lohara dynasty in which Kalhaṇa was embedded, the model provided by the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* provided way to speak both about and to the elite of the Shāh Mīrī Sultanate, the next stable regional power in the Valley.

Again what is to be stressed here is that the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre is both a source for inspiration and a site of negotiation. Similarly it is precisely to the *ślokakathā* genre that Śrīvara returns when he wants to accommodate new ideas, new texts, and new *śāstras* in the Sanskrit of Sultanate Kashmir. This way of writing and thinking provided an elasticity to Sanskrit literary culture in Kashmir and allowed Sanskrit and Sanskrit-speaking intellectuals the ability to take part successfully in the shifting ecology of Sultanate elite culture. The changing use of Sanskrit in Kashmir I would argue is something parallel to and closely related to the rise of vernacular literatures in the courts of South India described in Pollock's *Language of the Gods*. Similarly, charting the deployment and adaptation of the *rājataraṅgiṇī* and *ślokakathā* provides a way to glimpse how historicity worked in a very specific regional context. In such a way, reading these genres can provide something akin to Subrahmanyam, Shulman, and Narayana Rao's historical "texture" as new regionally and temporally bound sensibilities stretch the boundaries of what can and cannot be said in Sanskrit.

This is not to say that the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and *Rājataraṅgiṇī* operate in the same framework of "vernacularization" espoused by Pollock. I hold that the works of Somadeva and Kalhaṇa provide an important historical testimony to the ways in which new sensibilities were entering into elite literary culture in the first centuries of the second millennium. While not vernacular in terms of language, it seems to me that these works were vernacular in the sense that they consciously rooted older forms in a regionalized intellectual culture. In such a way, the *ślokakathā* and *rājataraṅgiṇī* forms could still speak to the elite culture of the Shāh Mīrī Sultanate in very direct ways. That Jonarāja—and to a greater extent Śrīvara—managed to integrate Sanskrit literary culture in some important way into the formation of a regionalized elite shows a certain fluidity in the role of Sanskrit as it worked to find its place in a rapidly changing literary ecology. The *ślokakathā* and the *rājataraṅgiṇī* show vernacularization not in terms of language (although the stylistics of both genres show a marked departure from the norms of previous *belles lettres*) but rather in terms of the mentality that underlies their literary projects.

In the end then, this dissertation traces a type of Sanskrit that is just beginning to be recognized and theorized, neither fully "cosmopolitan" not fully "vernacular", but rather existing in a more fluid and experimental place as Sanskrit and Sanskrit speaking intellectuals attempted to negotiate a place for themselves and their craft in the rapidly shifting literary ecology of second millennium South Asia.

8.2. Connections and Future Directions

This dissertation has limited itself to four authors and the arguments developed depend on close readings of specific episodes within these works. While the approach of this dissertation is selective, I chose to highlight those episodes which demonstrate what I see as the underlying literary and historical projects of Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara. But I also am interested in revealing the tensions and contradictions that challenge and threaten to undermine them. In doing so, this dissertation traces the movement of a specific sort of textualized historicity in early second millennium Kashmir. In this way, the work here represents a first step toward a larger project of reading and understanding Kashmiri historiography from the tenth century onward.

While Kalhaṇa and Somadeva are rather well known parts of the modern Sanskrit canon, their followers are less widely read and studied. Including Jonarāja and Śrīvara demonstrates that the Kashmiri tradition of history writing was kept alive and valorized enough in the following centuries to have an important place within elite Sultanate culture in Kashmir. Furthermore, Śrīvara's composition of the *Kathākautuka* in the court of Muḥammad Shāh shows that the translational logic of the Kashmiri *ślokakathā* gained new relevance in the Persianizing court. The Sultanate texts demonstrate that the history-making potential of the genres developed in the past continued to expand and evolve in different times and contexts. However, I must stress that the story of the *rājataraṅgiṇī* and the *ślokakathā* told in this dissertation is only partial; the writing of *rājataraṅgiṇīs* does not end with Śrīvara or with the demise of the Shāh Mīrīs. *Rājataraṅgiṇīs* continued to be written up until the final edition of Kalhaṇa's text by Aurel Stein in at the end of the nineteenth century. The later tradition after the Sultanate period must also be studied, though it seems that after Sultan Zayn and Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, the poet and ruler

never shared the same sort of closeness as shown in Jonarāja and Śrīvara's *rājataraṅgiṇīs*, and that the composition of these texts were never so closely imbricated in the creation of certain sorts of regional elite identities. Here I lay out a brief overview of the career of the *rājataraṅgiṇī* in Kashmir after Śrīvara, and offer some comments on work left to be done to gain a fuller picture of the scope of this literature.

After the end of Śrīvara's histories in 1484, more than a century elapses before the text of any other *rājataraṅgiṇī* survives in the Valley. In the middle of the sixteenth century, a poet by the name of Prājyabhaṭṭa takes the history of Kashmir forward through the end of the Shāh Mīrīs and the ascendancy of the Chāks; unfortunately, his work was lost by the Mughal period. The poet Śuka (who mentions Prājyabhaṭṭa but had not seen his work) continues the *rājataraṅgiṇī* tradition into the reign of the Mughals after the annexation of Kashmir in 1589. Even into the reign of the Sikhs and the Dogras, attempts were made to continue the history of Kashmir in Sanskrit right up to the late nineteenth century. The editor of the modern printed Sanskrit text, Aurel Stein, employed Sanskrit *paṇḍitas* to help identify proper names and unravel difficulties of the manuscripts' orthography and Kalhaṇa's diction. The work of these *paṇḍitas*, especially Govind Kaul, provides a glimpse into the making of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* in colonial modernity and also deserves closer scrutiny in the future.

With these later works in mind, this dissertation does not intend to be the final definitive statement on Kashmiri historiography, but rather the first step in understanding the story of Kashmiri history making from the eleventh century to the beginning of the twentieth century. However much work remains to be done before any sort of serious longitudinal literary study can take place. Further study depends on careful philologically grounded textual scholarship; new editions and translations must be undertaken taking into account the manuscripts and the manuscript tradition. Walter Slaje's new edition and translation of Jonarāja, *Kingship in Kaśmīr*, is exemplary in this regard, given that he carefully traces the differences between different recensions of Jonarāja's text and shows how the original was supplemented in later centuries. While the manuscript tradition of Śrīvara's *rājataraṅgiṇīs* do not seem to have the same pattern of variance, a new edition of Śrīvara's histories is very much to be desired. The translations of Kashi Nath Dhar and Jogesh Chandra also must be revisited.

Similarly, the actual text of *Kathākautuka*, the *ślokakathā* translation of Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*, demands further attention. Neither the edition of Parab in the Kāvyamālā series and Schmidt's edition can be called critical, and both can be improved not only with a careful comparison with the extant manuscripts, but also by considering the parallels to the Persian *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*. In many instances the editions print less likely—or even nonsensical—readings when the Persian text offers grounds for selecting another reading or making emendations. The philological project of preparing a new edition using the Persian as a witness will shed light on the history of social and cultural transformation

Even beyond the formation of stable critical texts, the transmission and reception history of Kashmiri texts deserves much closer attention. Scribes and intellectuals like the great seventeenth century writer Ratnakaṇṭha, on whose manuscript Aurel Stein based his manuscript, need to be taken into fuller account. Similarly the movement of the works of these four authors into Persian contexts through translation. Satoshi Ogura and Chitralekha Zutshi have begun the exploration of the Persian translations of these texts in

Kashmir, the Mughal Court, and beyond. A multilingual history of Kashmiri Sanskrit texts and their transmission is an important area of further research.

Beyond the philological work, historicizing and theorizing the development and growth of Kashmiri historicity demands further attention. Models based on western historiography or Sanskrit *kāvya* aesthetics can provide interesting readings, but fail to provide large-scale interpretive schemes for any of the four authors discussed here. Furthermore, the works of Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja and Śrīvara must be placed in conversation with larger histories of South Asia. Their works appear during two of the most interesting—and controversial moments in the periodicization of South Asian history: Somadeva and Kalhaṇa occupy the end of the first millennium which tends to be defined as the classical era of Sanskrit letters while Jonarāja and Śrīvara's works occur during the first centuries of stabilization of Islamic dynasties. The nexus between vernacularization and the rise of Islamic (or Persianate) polities in the Subcontinent connect larger issues of historical periodicization and social and religious change throughout the region. The way modern scholars talk about these issues is largely determined by their disciplinary background and sources; the second millennium tends to become the purview of historians and those working on Islamic (mainly Persian but also Arabic) or vernacular texts. Somadeva, Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja, and Śrīvara provide glimpses into an alternate Sanskrit-centered imagination of textual transmission and historicity that can challenge, refine, and supplement current histories of South Asia.

8.3 Toward a History of Historicity

The very notion of historicity in South Asia is a vast topic, and one that has just begun to be explored. Sanskrit texts have been mined for nuggets of historical fact by modern scholars for more than two centuries, but only recently has the very nature of historicity in Sanskrit texts begun to be explored. The works highlighted in this dissertation provide a diachronic look at the ways in which Sanskrit-speaking intellectuals in one particular region sought to assert themselves. Drawing upon past literary tradition, Somadeva provides the baseline for a certain mode of thinking while Kalhaṇa develops it into a fully-fledged type of historical narrative. While modern scholars quibble over the definition of history and whether or not it should apply to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, this dissertation read history from the inside out, looking carefully at the choices that Kalhaṇa makes not to see if it fits a western model, but rather to pay attention to the makeup of the text itself, the choices it makes and the tools it uses. This form of historicity is not fixed, and the later historians Jonarāja and Śrīvara continue adapt Kalhaṇa's model to fit changing circumstances. The picture of historicity that develops is neither extendable to a "Sanskritic" or pan-South Asian mentality nor parallel to modern or western notions. The Kashmiri tradition discussed here speaks to a different and regionalized way of seeing the world and placing oneself within it.

In the end, this dissertation hopes to decenter the notion of history as a universalizing and totalizing narrative. Rather these Kashmiri texts show one iteration of a Sanskritic historicity, one that roots itself in a specific textual genealogy and one which seeks to assert itself in particular historical moments and social circumstances. While incredibly powerful in its specific time and place, as it moved through time it became dependent upon the elite spaces of the Shāh Mīrī Sultanate, and with the decline of the

Sultanate, the historiographical models offered by Jonarāja and Śrīvara also became untenable. While the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre continued to be written within the Valley, it never became mainstream in Sanskrit discourse, and never again attained the same place of prominence in elite courtly circles. However, tracing the deployment of the *rājataraṅgiṇī* genre, especially during the reign of the later Shāh Mīrīs, provides hints toward possibilities for imagining Sanskrit in the formative years of Islamic power in South Asia.

Bibliography:

Abhinanda. *Kādambarīkathāsāra*. Edited by Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Bombay [Mumbai]: Nirnaya-Sagara Press, 1925.

Ahmad, Aziz. "Epic and Counter Epic in Medieval India." *JAOS* 84, 4 (1963): 470-476.

Algar, Hamid. *Jāmī*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2013.

Ali, Daud. *Courtly Culture and Political Life in Early Medieval India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Ānandavardhana. *The Dhvanyaloka of Anandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta*. Translated by Daniel H. H. Ingalls, J. M. Masson, and N. Patwardhan. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass, 1990.

Ānandavardhana. *Dhvanyālokaḥ*. Edited by P. N Pattabhirama Sastri. Varanasi: Caukhambha Samskrta Samsthana, 2009.

Baharistān-i Shāhī: A Chronicle of Mediaeval Kashmir. Edited and Translated by K. N. Pandit. Calcutta: Firma KLM, 1991.

Bhāravi. *Mahākavibhāravipraṇītaṃ Kirātārjunīyam: Traisargikaṃ : Nṛsiṃha-Prakāśavarṣa-Jonarājakṛtābhiḥ ṭīkābhiḥ vibhūṣitam*. Edited by Viroopaksha Jaddipal. Dillī [Delhi]: Amara Grantha Pablikeśansa, 2008.

Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Edited and translated by Dominic Goodall. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, 1998.

Bharata. *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata*. Edited by Baṭuka Nātha Śarmā and Baladeva Upādhyāya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 1980.

Bilhaṇa. *Vikramāṅkitadevacarita*.

Bronner, Yigal. *Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement of Simultaneous Narration*. New York, Columbia University Press, 2010.

Bronner, Yigal. "The Poetics of Ambivalence: Imagining and Unimagining the Political in Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*." *JIP* 38, 5 (2010): 457-483.

Bronner, Yigal. "From Conqueror to Connoisseur: Kalhaṇa's Account of Jayāpīḍa and the Fashioning of Kashmir as a Kingdom of Learning." *IESHR* 50, 2 (2013): 161-177.

Bronner, Yigal and David Shulman. "'A Cloud Turned Goose': Sanskrit in the Vernacular Millenium." *IESHR* 43, 2 (2006): 1-30.

Broquet, Sylvain. *La Geste de Rāma: Poème à double sens de Sandhyākaranandin (Introduction, texte, traduction, analyse)*. Pondicherry: Institut Françaid de Pondichéry, 2010.

Bühler, Georg. *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Mss made in Kaśmir, Rajputana, and Central India*. London: Trübner and Co., 1877.

Chatterjee, Partha. "Introduction: History in the Vernacular." In *History in the Vernacular*. Edited by Raziuddin Aquil and Partha Chatterjee. Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2008.

Chattopadhyaya, Brajadulal. *Representing the Other?: Sanskrit Sources and the Muslims (Eighth to Fourteenth Century)*. New Delhi: Manohar, 1998.

Whitney Cox, "Saffron in the Rasam," in *South Asian Texts in History: Critical Engagements with Sheldon Pollock*. Edited by Yigal Bronner, Whitney Cox, and Lawrence McCrea, 177-201. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Cox, Whitney. "Literary Register and Historical Consciousness in Kalhaṇa: A Hypothesis." *IESHR* 50, 2 (Apr. 2013): 131-160.

Daṇḍin. *Kāvyādarśa*. Poona [Pune]: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1938.

Daṇḍin. *Avantisundarīkathāsāra*. Madras [Chennai]: Kuppuswami Research Institute, 1957.

De, Sushil Kumar. "The Akhyayika and the Katha in Classical Sanskrit." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 3, 3 (1924): 504-517.

Digby, Simon. "Export Industries and Handicraft Production under the Sultanates of Kashmir." *IESHR* 44, 4 (2007): 407-423.

Dutt, Jogesh Chandra. *Medieval Kashmir*. Ed. by S. L. Sadhu. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributers, 1993.

Eaton, Richard Maxwell. *The Rise of Islam and the Bengal Frontier, 1204-1760*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Fitzgerald, James L. "History and Primordium in Ancient Indian Historical Writing: *Itihāsa* and *Purāna* in the *Mahābhārata* and Beyond." In *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, edited by Kurt Raaflaub, 41-60. Malden (Mass.) and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.

Flood, Finbarr. *Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval "Hindu-Muslim" Encounter*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Franke, Heike. "Die persischen Übersetzungen des *Laghuyogavāśiṣṭha*." In *The Mokṣopāya, Yogavāsiṣṭha and Related Texts*. Edited by Jürgen Hanneder, 113-29. Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2005.

Gibbon, Edward. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. New York: Random House, 1960.

Hardy, Peter. *Historians of Medieval India: Studies in Indo-Muslim Historical Writing*. Luzac: London, 1960.

Hasan, Mohibbul. *Kashmir under the Sultans*. Aakar Books: Delhi, 2005.

Herodotus. *The Histories*. Edited by Walter Blanco and Jennifer Tolbert Roberts. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.

Hasan, Farhat. *State and Locality in Mughal India: Power Relations in Western India, c. 1572-1730*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Hultzsch, Eugen. "Extracts from Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī." *IA* 18 (1889).

Hultzsch, Eugen. "Extracts from Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī." *IA* 19 (1890).

Hultzsch, Eugen. "Critical Notes on Kalhaṇa's Seventh Taraṅga." *IA* 40 (1911).

Hultzsch, Eugen. "Critical Notes on Kalhaṇa's Eigth Taraṅga." *IA* 42 (1913).

Hultzsch, Eugen. "Kritische Bemerkungen zur *Rājataraṅgiṇī*." *ZDMG* 69 (1915): 271-282.

Hodgson, Marshall. *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Jāmī, Abdur Rahmān. (1892) *Yúsuf and Zulaikha: A Poem by Jámi*. Trans. Ralph. T. H. Griffith. Trübner & Co.: London.

Jāmī, Abdur Rahmān. (1824) *Joseph un Suleïcha; historisch-romantisches Gedicht aus dem Persichen des Mewlana Abdurrahman Dschami übersetzt und durch Anmerkungen erläutert von Vincenz Edlem von Rosenzweig*. Wien [Vienna]: Anton Schmid.

Jāmī, Abdur Rahmān. (1980) *Yusuf and Zulaikhā: An Allegorical Romance by Hakim Nuruddin Jami*. Ed., trans., and abridged by David Pendlebury. Octagon Press: London.

Jayānaka. *Pṛthvīrājavijayamahākāvyam*. Edited by Ojha. Jodhapura: Rājasthānī Granthāgāra, 1997.

Jonarāja. *Kingship in Kaśmīr (AD 1148-1459) From the Pen of Jonarāja, Court Paṇḍit to Sulṭān Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn*. Edited and Translated by Walter Slaje. Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittemberg, 2014.

Kalhaṇa. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr*. Edited and translated by Marc Aurel Stein. Constable: Westminster, 1900.

Kalidāsa. *Meghadūta. Kālidāsa's Meghadūta : Edited from Manuscripts with the Commentary of Vallabhadeva and Provided with a Complete Sanskrit-English Vocabulary*. Edited by E. Hultzsch. Hertford: Steven Austin and Sons, 1911.

Kalhaṇa. *The Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa, Vol. III: Containing the Supplements to the Work of Jonarāja, Śrīvara and Prājyabhāṭṭa*. Edited by P. Peterson and Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda. Bombay: Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1896.

Kapadia, Aparna. "The Last Chakravartin: The Gujarati Sultan as 'Universal King' in Fifteenth Century Sanskrit Poetry" in *The Medieval History Journal* 16:1 (2013)

Kaul, Shonaleekha. "Kalhaṇa's Kashmir: Aspects of the Literary Production of Space in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*." *Indian Historical Review* 40, 2 (2013): 207-22.

Khan, Mohammad Ishaq. *Kashmir's Transition to Islam: The Role of Muslim Rishis, Fifteenth to Eighteenth Century*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers & Distributors, 1994.

Kölver, Bernhard. *Textkritische und Philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājataraṅgiṇī des Kalhaṇa*. Weisbaden: F. Steiner, 1971.

Kreyenborg, Elisabeth. "Der XXV. Gesang des Srikanthacaritam des Mankha. Ein Beitr. z. altind. Literaturgeschichte." PhD Dissertation, Universität Münster, 1929.

Kṣemendra. *Suvṛttatilaka*. In *Kṣemendra Studies: Text with English Translation*. Translated by Suryakanta. Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Prakashan, 2010.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Leclère, Basile. "Ambivalent Representations of Muslims in Medieval Indian Theatre." *Studies in History* 27, 2 (2011): 155-195.

Lacôte, Felix. *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā, suivi du texte inédit des chapitres XXVII à XXX du Nepāla-māhātmya*. Paris: E Leroux, 1908.

Lanman, Charles Rockwell. *A Sanskrit Reader: Text and Vocabulary and Notes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1884.

Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*. New York: D. Appleton

and Company, 1900.

Mandal, Bankim Chandra. *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita, a Mahākāvya of Maṅkhaka: Literary Study with an Analysis of Social, Political, and Historical Data of Kashmir of the 12th Century A.D*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1991.

Maṅkha. *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita. Śrīmaṅkhakakaviviracitaṃ Śrīkaṇṭhacaritam: Jonarājakṛtayā Ṭīkayā Sametam*. Dillī [Delhi]: Motīlāla Banārasīdāsa, 1993.

Masson, J. L. and M. V. Patwardhan. *Śāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics*. Poona [Pune]: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,1969.

E. P. Maten. *Budhasvāmin's Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha: A Literary Study of an Ancient Indian Narrative*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

McCrea, Lawrence. *The Teleology of Poetics in Medieval Kashmir*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008.

McCrea, Lawrence. "Poetry Beyond Good and Evil: Bilhaṇa and the Tradition of Patron-Centered Court Epic." In *JIP* 38 (2010): 503-518.

McCrea, Lawrence. "*Śāntarasa* in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*: History, Epic, and Moral Decay." In *IESHR* 50, 2 (2013): 179-199.

Mill, James. *A History of British India, Vol. 1*. New Delhi: Associate Publishing House 1972.

Minkowski, Christopher. "King David in Oudh: a Bible story in Sanskrit and the Just King at an Afghan Court." http://users.ox.ac.uk/~ball2185/Minkowski.Inaugural.pdf. Mar. 7, 2006.

Narayana Rao, Velcheru, David Shulman and Sanjay Subrahmanyam. *Textures of Time: Writing History in South India 1600-1800*. New York: Other Press, 2003.

Nelson, Donald. "The *Bṛhatkathā*: A Reconstruction from the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, *Peruṅkatai* and *Vasudevahiṃḍi*" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1974).

Obrock, Luther. "Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and the Development of a Kashmiri Style." In *Highland Philology: Results of a Text-Related Kashmir Panel at the 31st DOT, Marburg, 2010*, edited by Roland Steiner. Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittemburg, 2012.

Obrock, Luther. "History at the End of History: Śrīvara's *Jainataraṅgiṇī*." *IESHR* 50, 2 (2013): 221-236.

Onians, Isabelle. Introduction to *What Ten Young Men Did*, by Daṇḍin. New York: New York University Press, 2005.

Orsini, Francesca. "How to Do Multilingual History? Lessons from Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century North India." *IESHR* 49, 2 (2012): 225-246.

Peterson, Indira Viswanathan. *Design and Rhetoric in a Sanskrit Court Epic: The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.

Phukan, Shantanu. "'Through Throats Where Many Rivers Meet': The Ecology of Hindi in the World of Persian." *IESHR* 38: 3 (2001): 33-58.

Pollock, Sheldon. "Ramayana and Political Imagination in India." *Journal of Asian Studies* 52, 2 (1993): 261–297.

Pollock, Sheldon. "The Death of Sanskrit." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 43, 2 (2001) 392-426.

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

Pollock, Sheldon. "Pretextures of Time." *History and Theory* 46 (2007): 364-381.

Raghavan, V. *The Number of Rasas*. Madras [Chennai]: Adyar Library and Research Center, 1967.

Ramaswamy, Sumathi. "Sanskrit for the Nation." *Modern Asian Studies* 33.2 (1999): 339-381.

Ramanujan, A. K. "Three Hundred Rāmāyaṇas: Five Examples and Three Thoughts on Translation." In *The Collected Essays of A. K. Ramanujan*. Edited V. Dharwadker, 131-160. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Rizvi, Sajjad. (2006) "The Existential Breath of *al-Raḥmān* and the Munificent Grace of *al-Raḥīm*: the Tafsīr Sūrat al-Fātiḥa of Jāmī and the School of Ibn 'Arabi." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies*. 8/1. 58-87.

Roy, Kumkum. "The Making of a Mandala: Fuzzy Frontiers of Kalhaṇa's Kashmir." *The Power of Gender and the Gender of Power: Explorations in Early Indian History*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Sarvarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *Hindutva*. Poona: S. R. Date, 1942.

Sattar, Arshia. Introduction to *Tales from the Kathāsaritsāgara*, by Somadeva. London: Penguin, 1994.

Schmidt, Richard. *Das Kathākautukam des Śrīvara Verglichen mit Dschāmī's Jusuf und Zuleikha*. Kiel: Hasseler Verlag, 1883.

Sheikh, Samira. *Forging a Region: Sultans, Traders, and Pilgrims in Gujarat 1200-1500*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Sikand, Yoginder. "Hazrat Bulbul Shah: The First Known Muslim Missionary in Kashmir." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 20, 2 (2000): 361–367.

Slaje, Walter. *Vom Mokṣopāya-Śāstra zum Yogavāśiṣṭha-Mahārāmayaṇa*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994.

Slaje, Walter. "Liberation from Intentionality and Involvement: On the Concept of *Jīvanmukti* According to the Mokṣopāya." *JIP* 28 (2000): 171-94.

Slaje, Walter. "On the Genesis of the So-Called *Jaina-Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī*." In *JOAS* 125, 1 (2005): 379-388.

Slaje, Walter. "Three Bhaṭṭas, Two Sulṭāns, and the Kashmirian Atharvaveda." In *The Atharvaveda and Its Paippalādaśākha: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*. Edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen. 329-53. Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2007.

Slaje, Walter. "'In the Guise of Poetry' – Kalhaṇa Reconsidered." In *Śāstrārambha: Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit*. Edited by Walter Slaje. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 2008.

Slaje, Walter. "Geschichte *schreiben*: Vier historiographische Prologe aus Kaschmir." *ZMDG* 158, 2 (2008) 317-51.

Slaje, Walter. *Kingship in Kaśmīr (AD 1148-1459) From the Pen of Jonarāja, Court Paṇḍit to Sulṭān Zayn al-'Ābidīn*. Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittemburg, 2014.

Somadeva. *The Ocean of Story: Being C. H. Tawney's Translation of Somadeva's Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara, Now Edited, with Introduction, Fresh Explanatory Notes*. By N. M. Penzer. London: C. J. Sawyer, 1924-28.

Somadeva. *The Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara: Or, Ocean of the Streams of Story*. Translated by C. H. Tawney. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1968.

Somadeva. *The Kathāsaritsāgara. Kathāsaritsāgaraḥ: Kaśmīrapradeśavāsinā Śrīrāmabhaṭṭanūdbhavena Mahākaviśrīsomadevabhaṭṭena Viracitaḥ*. Dillī [Delhi]: Motīlāla Banārsīdāsa, 1977.

Śrīvara. *The Rājataraṅgiṇī of Śrīvara and Śuka*. Edited by S. Kaul. Vishveshvaranand

Vedic Research Institute: Hoshiarpur, 1966.

Śrīvara's Zaina Rājataraṅgiṇī. English Translation and Annotations by Kashi Nath Dhar. Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research and People's Publishing House, 1994.

Śrīvara. *Śrīvara's Kathākautuka: Die Geschichte von Joseph in Persisch-Indischem Gewande Sanskrit und Deutsch.* Edited by Richard Schmidt. C. F. Haeseler: Kiel, 1898.

Stein, Marc Aurel. Introduction to *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr.* Edited and translated by Marc Aurel Stein. Constable: Westminster, 1900.

Stewart, Tony K. "In Search of Equivalence: Conceiving Muslim-Hindu Encounter Through Translation Theory." *History of Religions* 40/3 (2001): 260-287.

Stinner, Suzanne. "Praefatio." In *Anonymus Casmiriensis Moksopaya. Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe, Teil 1. Moksopaya.* Edited by S. Stinner. Harrasowitz Verlag: Wiesbaden, 2011.

Thapar, Romila. *Somanatha: The Many Voices of a History*. New York: Verso, 2005.

Truschke, Audrey. "Cosmopolitan Encounters: Sanskrit and Persian at the Mughal Court." PhD Dissertation, Columbia University, 2012.

Um, Janet. "Crossing the Ocean of Story" MA Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2012.

Vallabhadeva. *Subhāṣitāvali*. Edited by Durgāprasāda and Peter Peterson. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1961.

Vittor, Frank. (1978) *The Herat School: Persian Poetry in the Timurid Period*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Wagoner, Philip. "'Sultan Among Hindu Kings': Dress, Titles, and the Islamicization of Hindu Culture at Vijaynagara." *Journal of Asian Studies* 55, 4 (1996): 851-880.

Warder, A. K. *Indian Kāvya Literature*. Vol. VII, Part 2. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1972.

"A Worldwide Literature: Jāmī (1414-1492) in the *Dār al-Islām* and Beyond." http://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/jamidaralislam/

Zutshi, Chitralekha. *Languages of Belonging: Islam, Regional Identity, and the Making of Kashmir*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2004.

Zutshi, Chitralekha. "Translating the Past: Rethinking 'Rajatarangini' Narratives in Colonial India," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 70, 1 (2011): 5–27.

Zutshi, Chitralekha. "Past as Tradition, Past as History: The *Rajatarangini* Narratives in Kashmiri Persian Historiography." *IESHR* 50, 2 (2013) 201-219.