

## Prefatory Remarks

Arlo Griffiths

While no thematic volumes of papers exist, to my knowledge, on the traditions of the other three Vedas, the traditions of the Atharvaveda do seem to be a favored topic. A volume of *Historical and Critical Studies in the Atharvaveda* was published in 1981 by Suryakant BALI (Delhi: Nag Publishers), presenting papers from a seminar that took place at Delhi University in 1980. More recently, Abhijit GHOSH has brought out *Ātharvaṇā, a collection of essays on the Atharvaveda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition* (Kolkata: Sanskrit Book Depot, 2002), mainly comprising papers presented at a seminar that took place at Jadavpur University in 2001. Another volume, in commemoration of the Oriya Sanskritist K.C. Acharya, was published by Acharya's pupil Prafulla K. MISHRA in 2003: *New Dimensions in the Atharvaveda* (Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan).

The clear difference between those volumes and the present one lies in the direct connection with primary material, in manuscript form, that is maintained in almost all papers collected here: that primary material, which is quite rich, has to a large extent not been made known yet or studied at all. Several of the most pertinent questions concerning the history of the Atharvavedic, and specifically the Paippalāda traditions, moreover, remained unsolved even after publication of three volumes dedicated to this field of study. Bringing out yet another thematic volume dealing with the Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda-Śākhā, one that focuses specifically on the unpublished material and on the historical problems surrounding the Paippalāda tradition, does not, therefore, seem to require any further justification.

\*\*\*

The ten papers collected here can be divided into five categories. The contribution by PHILIPP KUBISCH presents the results of his study of **Atharvavedic Meter** on the basis of kāṇḍas 1–7 of the 'vulgate' *Śaunakasaṃhitā*. In the context of this volume, however, his contribution also intends to lay the basis for a sophisticated treatment of the metrical patterns found in and metrical problems posed by the *Paippalādasamhitā*, that is still in the process of being edited. A reviewer of Dipak BHATTACHARYA's 1997 *editio princeps* of *Paippalādasamhitā* kāṇḍas 1–15, justly observed about that edition: "no attention seems to have been paid to prosody".<sup>1</sup> Developing an adequate terminological apparatus for the analysis of the metrical irregularities of Atharvavedic meter is a desideratum felt by all those involved in editing the *Paippalādasamhitā*, several of whom are contributors to this volume. At first sight, the apparatus developed by Kubisch in his

---

<sup>1</sup>J.C. WRIGHT, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 65 [2002], 194–196, p. 194.

contribution seems both remarkably thorough and complex. Kubish is at this time preparing an edition of kāṇḍa 20, which will allow him to test in practice the utility of his analytic apparatus, and we look forward eagerly to the results.

The next four contributions deal directly with **Material from the Paippalādasamhitā**. ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY presents a new edition with translation of the hymn 8.15, whose contents have certain implications for the relative chronology of the *Ṛgvedasamhitā* and (this part of) the *Paippalādasamhitā*. The paper illustrates the extent to which improvements can be made upon the *editio princeps*, and exemplifies the interesting information that can be culled from all parts of this text, which is still half-unpublished. WERNER KNOBL'S wide-ranging paper arrives as a convincing explanation for the two hitherto unknown words *jātravya-* and *abhīlī-*, the first of which had to be resurrected from the corrupt manuscript-readings in a passage which had been previously edited, while the latter is found in kāṇḍa 20, hitherto unpublished on the basis of Orissa manuscripts. YASUHIRO TSUCHIYAMA starts from the hymn 10.4, and tries to show the interest of the material contained in kāṇḍa 10 for the history of royalty in Indian social history. TIMOTHY LUBIN'S contribution is a bridge to the next group of contributions, in that it shows the value of a the *Nīlarudropaniṣad*, a text composed entirely out of verses culled from the *Paippalādasamhitā*, for the *textus constitutio* of the latter, but also uses this 'Upaniṣad' as a starting point for important observations on the medieval history of the Atharvavedic transmission in western India, and from there to the East.

There are two contributions that deal specifically with the only surviving stronghold of Paippalāda traditions, **The Atharvavedic Tradition of Orissa**. Both papers deal with different genres of the literary heritage of this tradition. In my own contribution, I build up a survey of the Atharvavedic ancillary literature preserved in Orissa around another 'Upaniṣadic' work, called *Caranavyūhopaniṣad*. ALEXIS SANDERSON demonstrates the interest of one of the extant ancillary genres, that of tantric texts attributed to the *Āṅgirasakalpa*, which have considerable interest for the evaluation of the medieval role of Atharvavedic priests in the broader religious landscape of Orissa.

The following pair of papers deal with **The Atharvavedic Tradition of Kashmir**, a tradition that seems to have left no physical traces except for the famous Tübingen birchbark manuscript of the *Paippalādasamhitā* in Śāradā script. WALTER SLAJE'S paper discusses the historical events leading up to the copying of this manuscript, or its exemplar, in the year 1419 AD, and provides the background that can explain the need for a re-import of the text into Kashmir from 'Karnataka' in the early 15<sup>th</sup> century, the extraordinarily corrupt nature of the sole Kashmirian witness, and the fact that the corrupt nature of the text as contained in it could never be improved upon from oral tradition — because such a tradition, if it had been alive until the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, could not have survived the politico-religious of the time described in this contribution. That there must have been an earlier tradition of the Paippalāda Atharvaveda

in Kashmir, and one that knew more genres than the Saṃhitā which is the sole genre that the Kashmir tradition has transmitted to modern times, is proven by KEI KATAOKA's contribution on the Kashmirian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, generally known as Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. With these two papers, all of the currently known historical sources pertaining to the Paippalāda tradition in Kashmir are covered.<sup>2</sup>

The final contribution deals with **Epigraphical Evidence** concerning Atharvavedic traditions in medieval India. ANNETTE SCHMIEDCHEN is able to add some new entries to the previously known epigraphical record relative to Atharvavedic brahmins. She provides a valuable contextualization, against the background of what is known from (copper-plate) epigraphy about medieval land donation practices, of the relevant inscriptions, and the information they contain on settlement and migration of Atharvavedic brahmins. The resulting picture points out early medieval Gujarat, and later medieval North Bengal and Orissa, as centers of Atharvavedic learning, and is of considerable relevance to the debate concerning the transmissional history of the *Paippalādasamhitā*.<sup>3</sup>

\*\*\*

This volume contains eight papers that were presented during a panel at the 29<sup>th</sup> *Deutsche Orientalistentag* in Halle, in 2004. Also on behalf of my co-editor, who has been kind enough to allow me to write these prefatory remarks, I

<sup>2</sup>Durgamohan BHATTACHARYYA's 1955 paper "Lights on the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda" (*Our Heritage* III.1, 1–14), contains a reconstruction of the text called *Atharvavidhāna* preserved in the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* (II.127) and the *Agnipurāṇa* (262), with reference to many parallels in Atharvavedic primary and ancillary texts. If it can be shown that the AgP copied this from the VDhP, and that the latter text presents the 'original' composition, this *Atharvavidhāna* could — since the origins of the VDhP lie "in Kashmir or a neighbouring region" (A. SANDERSON in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47 [2004], 229–300, particularly p. 275) — turn out to constitute a third piece of information about the nature and extent of AV tradition in medieval Kashmir.

<sup>3</sup>Southern India, and specifically the region now known as Karnataka, notwithstanding claims to the contrary (see D. BHATTACHARYYA's Introduction to his edition of *Paippalādasamhitā* 1–15 [1997], pp. xxxviii f. and xlix, with further references), is not likely to have played any role of importance in this transmission. There are only two epigraphical mentions of Atharvavedic brahmins falling in the modern borders of Karnataka and early enough to precede the attested arrival of Paippalādins in Eastern India, but none of the scant South Indian epigraphical evidence is explicitly connected with the Paippalāda-Śākhā. I take this opportunity to rescind my own statement in a paper published in 2002 (referred to and justly criticised in n. 8 of Walter Slaje's contribution to this volume). In that 2002 paper, I suggested that 'Karnata(ka)', in the reference to a medieval import of the Atharvaveda into Kashmir from *Karṇāṭa*, might have denoted Orissa. I now believe it is considerably more likely that it denoted some part of western India north of modern Karnataka, most probably close to modern Gujarat, and to support this I refer to the New Delhi inscription (*Epigraphia Indica* 41 [@@], 49–57), which claims that the imperial Gurjara Pratihāras conquered 'Karnata(ka)' (*avajitāśeṣakarṇṇāṭa*) which here denotes the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom, that covered parts of Gujarat. Cf., however, the relevant information in Slaje's mentioned note.

would like to thank Kei Kataoka and Alexis Sanderson for their willingness to contribute important papers even though they had not formed part of the panel. We thank also Walter Slaje for accepting this volume in the series for which he is responsible, as well as Jürgen Hanneder and Kengo Harimoto for their help in taming the L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X software that has been used for typesetting this book. We gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to the board of the Glasenapp-Stiftung for a generous subvention towards the costs of printing this volume.

Leiden, April 2007





## Three Bhaṭṭas, Two Sultāns, and the Kashmirian Atharvaveda

Walter Slaje

In a recent paper, GRIFFITHS (2002) has touched upon the issue of a possible import of the Atharvaveda into Kashmir in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1</sup> A late medieval Kashmirian chronicle contains an account treating of such an import (Ps-JRT).<sup>2</sup> The problems related to this matter may be summarized by four major questions:

1. Is the account reliable at all?
2. What may have necessitated a textual import?
3. What is the role of the dated Tübingen Paippalādasamhitā manuscript in this process of transmission?
4. In what way might Sultān Zayn al-‘Ābidīn have been involved?

Here is a brief synopsis of the main textual sources at our disposal:

1. Jonarāja [JRT], a *contemporary eyewitness* of Zayn’s rule until AD 1458/59.
2. ‘Pseudo-Jonarāja’ [Ps-JRT], supplementary contemporaneous and retrospective accounts (from ca. 1413 until 1588).<sup>3</sup>
3. Śrīvara [ŚRT], another *contemporary eyewitness* of Zayn’s rule until AD 1486.

The first and third chronicles, JRT and ŚRT, are authored by court Paṇḍits of Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, who were aiming at compiling a comprehensive, uninterrupted history in the line of Kalhaṇa’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī, updating the earlier chronicle(s) by their eyewitness accounts.<sup>4</sup> The relationship between the texts of the two chroniclers is, in short, the following: Jonarāja’s original text breaks off in AD 1458/59, the year of the author’s death. This is the so-called shorter, or Śāradā recension in 976 verses (JRT), published in the Calcutta edition (1835) of all the four Rājatarāṅgiṇīs. There is also a longer, Nāgarī-recension (Bombay 1896), enlarged by some 350 verses, which had been interpolated in the second

---

<sup>1</sup>GRIFFITHS 2002: 42f.

<sup>2</sup>Ps-JRT \*121 (p. 173), B 1269–1272.

<sup>3</sup>Interpolated into JRT between AD 1561 and 1588.

<sup>4</sup>“This Kashmiri tradition of continual updating of earlier chronicles [...] seems to have been an old practice whose earlier examples are unfortunately now all lost” (SALOMON 1987: 152, comment on RT I 9–10).

half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. They seem to have been taken from independent and remarkably reliable Sanskrit sources, and should therefore be accorded serious weight. Since both recensions go by the same title under Jonarāja's authorship, it is advisable to differentiate between them appropriately by a telling designation. Therefore, I have conveniently attributed the interpolated passages to a fictitious 'Pseudo-Jonarāja', although we have to reckon with more than only one author responsible for the various interpolations. Śrīvara continued Jonarāja's account until the year 1486 (Muḥammad Šāh). Thus, his text<sup>5</sup> was completed well a hundred years earlier than Pseudo-Jonarāja's interpolations to Jonarāja's work. It is also worthy of note that in not a few instances Jonarāja, Śrīvara and Pseudo-Jonarāja supplement each other by way of their independent accounts given on specific events.<sup>6</sup>

Of the general reliability of the three medieval chronicles, I have treated elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> However, it is hoped that also the present paper will convey an impression of just what the historical importance of the Rājataranṅiṅīs really is. Let it be noted first that Pseudo-Jonarāja has left us an account on an Atharvaveda import *from Karṇāṭa* during Zayn's reign, by a Kashmiri Paṇḍit. According to GRIFFITHS, in the late Middle Ages the name *Karṇāṭa* could theoretically have referred to Orissa as well as to the modern South Indian region of that name, and if this were indeed the case, it would leave us in doubt as to the particular region Pseudo-Jonarāja had had in his mind when he was using it.<sup>8</sup> Anyhow, GRIFFITHS considered it doubtful whether such a distant voyage might ever have taken place and emphasized that there was no obvious reason for undertaking it.<sup>9</sup>

The dating of the Tübingen Paippalādasamhitā manuscript raises closely related problems. Calculations carried out by Claus VOGEL and provided with

<sup>5</sup>On the genesis and character of Śrīvara's work, see SLAJE, *forthc.* (a).

<sup>6</sup>Cp. Śrīvara's programmatic statement on this issue: *kenāpi hetunā tena proktaṃ madguruṇā na yat | tac cheṣavartinīṃ vāṇīṃ kariṣyāmi yathāmati ||*.

<sup>7</sup>SLAJE 2004; 2005.

<sup>8</sup>As GRIFFITHS saw it, any part of the region ruled in the 15<sup>th</sup> century by king Kapilendradeva could have been referred to with *Karṇāṭa*. "By 1464, after conquering territories stretching from Bengal in the North, to the Kaveri in the South, including large parts of the Vijayanagara empire, which was at that period commonly referred to as *Karṇāṭa*, the Sūryavaṃśī ruler Kapilendradeva assumed the proud title 'Gajapati Gauḍeśvara Navakoṭi Karṇāṭa-Kālavargeśvara' [cf. PANIGRAHI 1981, p. 202], and his title has been used by Gajapati rulers in Orissa ever since" (GRIFFITHS 2002: 43). GRIFFITHS' observation is interesting in itself, but it does not carry much weight in the present issue of locating Pseudo-Jonarāja's 'Karṇāṭa'. The less so, since there is epigraphical evidence for the presence of Atharvavedic brahmins in 'Southern Karṇāṭa' (~ the Vijayanagara area) around AD 1430, approximately the time of the presumable dating of the Kashmirian codex (AD 1419): see reference no. 22 in Annette Schmiechen's contribution to this volume. Furthermore, in Kalhaṇa's earlier Rājataranṅiṅī, *Karṇāṭa* is used clearly with reference to the South Indian region. Cp. the discussion of king Harṣa of Kashmir (r. 1089–1101) and his interest in the south by BASHAM 1948: 688–690.

<sup>9</sup>GRIFFITHS 2002: 43.



textual analyses by Michael WITZEL, resulted in the year AD 1419 (December 15, a Friday), as the only convincing date of the Codex ‘archetypus’, from which the Tübingen manuscript would have been copied together with the original dating.<sup>10</sup> Pseudo-Jonarāja’s record, according to which the Atharvaveda import had taken place during Zayn’s Sultanate could come into conflict with the accepted chronology. For Zayn al-‘Ābidīn’s reign is considered as settled and is generally, though not exclusively, given as from AD 1420 to 1470.

In consequence of this, and on account of the evidence we possess for a presence of the Atharvaveda in Kashmir already from the 7<sup>th</sup> century on,<sup>11</sup> we should rather consider re-import than import and ask ourselves whether there might really be a connection between the interpolated Ps-JRT account and the Kashmirian Paippalāda tradition.

Let us tackle the matter from GRIFFITHS’ choice of words first. He calls into question whether one may take the Rājatarāṅgiṇī passage dealing with the import into Kashmir of the Atharvaveda “serious as evidence for the history of the Paippalāda śākhā”, pointing out that is it couched in “rather mythological terms”.<sup>12</sup> There is, however, good reason to accept the medieval Rājatarāṅgiṇīs as what they are, namely veritable historical accounts. On the other hand, it is true that all our ‘Histories of India’ as well as the ‘Handbooks’ at our disposal would fully subscribe to GRIFFITHS’ characterisation — despite the fact that no scholar ever has furnished proof to justify dismissing the later Rājatarāṅgiṇīs as mere ‘stories’ or even ‘fairy-tales’. By using the words “mythological terms”, GRIFFITHS, it must be assumed, would have had in mind the first two Ślokas only of the relevant passage:

*tripañcāṅgamīte varṣavṛnde yāte kaleḥ kila |*  
*atharvakausalād droṇo raṇaṃ kurubalair vyadhāt ||*  
*kurubhir nihate droṇe tadātharvā nirāśrayaḥ |*

*śaraṅīkṛtavān vedāḥ karṇātān paṭucetanān ||* Ps-JRT 121\* (p. 173), B 1267–1268

When 653 years of the Kali[yuga] had passed, Droṇa waged war against the Kuru forces on account of [his] Atharvanic skills. After Droṇa had been slain by the Kurus, the Atharvaveda had lost support [and] sought the protection of the quick-witted Karṇātas.

<sup>10</sup>Cp. WITZEL 1985: 257 and 1994a: 11f.: “The MS is dated, according to the *amānta* scheme: Friday, December 15, 1419, when the 13<sup>th</sup> lunar day of the dark fortnight of Mārgaśīrṣa ended about 2 h. 48 m. after mean sunrise at Lankā. This fits all criteria. [. . .] The PS MS was copied in the famous *Ahalyā Maṭha* of Srinagar, by a member of the Mera [*Mīra*] clan already mentioned in the later Rājatarāṅgiṇīs.” [Note of the editors: see now also the postscript at the end of this paper.]

<sup>11</sup>Cp. the paper by Kei Kataoka in this volume; Annette Schmiedchen’s paper, also in this volume, refers as no. 11 to an inscription from 7<sup>th</sup> century Himachal Pradesh, indicating the presence of such Brahmins in that part of northern India in the same period.

<sup>12</sup>GRIFFITHS 2002: 43 and 42.

This is not as far-fetched as it might possibly appear at first sight. The 653 years referred to by Pseudo-Jonarāja had already been mentioned previously by Kalhaṇa (RT I 51) as the time having elapsed between the beginning of the Kaliyuga and the Mahābhārata war. Kalhaṇa regarded this date as coinciding with the first Kashmirian ruler, king Gonanda I.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, tradition would have derived a close relationship of Droṇa with the Atharvaveda from some statements on the matter in the Jayadrathavadhaparvan. There, Droṇa identifies himself and his knowledge of protective and healing magic, which he displays by reciting a series of characteristic *mantras*,<sup>14</sup> as standing in the tradition of Aṅgiras and the Atharvaveda.<sup>15</sup> Thus, ‘mythological’ as the Mahābhārata passage *qua* Mahābhārata may — though not necessarily needs to — seem to us, Pseudo-Jonarāja’s account has to be assessed as an attempt at ‘being historical’. As is well known, his famous predecessor in historiography, Kalhaṇa, in the absence of any other historical evidence, was forced to reconstruct ‘pre-history’ largely from the Mahābhārata.<sup>16</sup> To him, and to his successors in this discipline, the Mahābhārata was a history book, a textual *source for knowledge of the remote past*. Thus, Pseudo-Jonarāja would have drawn entirely on such ‘source material’, on historical evidence in his understanding. This, I feel, should be emphasized, since it sheds light on the Kashmirian historiographers’ scholarly approach to past events. Even in this — apparently — mythological passage there is thus no fancy, at least not on the part of the author of the Rājatarāṅgī.

### Three Bhaṭṭas

Three Bhaṭṭas,<sup>17</sup> called Sūha-, Yuddha-, and Śiryabhāṭṭa respectively, had directly or indirectly been involved in the re-import of the Atharvaveda into Kashmir. These three figures must now be brought into play.

#### Sūhabhaṭṭa (Mallīk Saif ad-dīn)

We have to start with Sūhabhaṭṭa. He has played an extraordinarily influential role in the early Islamization of Kashmir and has unintentionally caused the events that later seem to have necessitated a re-import of the Atharvaveda and of many more texts of ‘Hindu’<sup>18</sup> origin. Sūhabhaṭṭa, a Brahmin convert elevated to the rank of a general under Sulṭān Sikandar (r. AD 1389–1413) and to that of a

<sup>13</sup>STEIN 1900 (I): 11 on RT I 50f and chart on p. 134. Cp. also WITZEL 1990: 31ff.

<sup>14</sup>MBh VII 69, 41 ff.

<sup>15</sup>MBh VII 69, 65–67.

<sup>16</sup>STEIN 1900 (I): 11 (Introduction).

<sup>17</sup>On the significance of the appellative ‘Bhaṭṭa’ added to a personal name, i.e. pointing to a (ritually active) Brahmin householder, see SLAJE 2006.

<sup>18</sup>On the usage of this term in the Kashmirian cultural context, see SLAJE 2004: 2ff; 2005: notes 36ff.

prime minister under ʿAlī Šāh (r. AD 1413–1418/1420), had adopted the Muslim name of Mallīk Saif ad-dīn. According to the Sanskrit chronicles, he was one of the cruellest instigators of Hindu persecution that Kashmir ever suffered. Over a period of almost thirty years, from ca. 1390 to 1417, he relentlessly persecuted the Hindu community, aiming at a total abolition of Hindu creed, customs, and learning. Most important in the present regard, however, are some measures he took against traditional learning. By its suppression, Sūhabhaṭṭa not only deprived the Brahmins of their traditional basis for earning themselves a living, but also caused a break in the chain of the tradition of learning.<sup>19</sup> The ban on public Hindu religious practice caused innumerable Brahmins to leave their country (*videśagamana*) trying to maintain the purity of their caste outside Kashmir (*jātirakṣā*). There is no need to go into further details here. The majority of those who for various reasons could not go into exile or were prevented from doing so by Sūhabhaṭṭa’s forces, and who had not yet committed suicide, would have only survived by putting up a Muslim disguise (*mlecchaveṣa*). Even today, tradition still has it that only 11 Hindu families in the country survived the atrocities of those days.<sup>20</sup> The Hindu emigration saw the exodus of scripture, learning and literature as concomitant circumstances. The Paṇḍits tried to rescue their manuscripts from Sūhabhaṭṭa’s actions, which, besides the demolition of shrines, had also been extended to the burning of manuscripts. Therefore, the Paṇḍits took them along to their places of exile. Whatever Atharvaveda tradition there may have been in Kashmir before Sūhabhaṭṭa’s persecutions commenced, would certainly have been in danger of extermination as their result.

### Yuddhabhaṭṭa

The chroniclers emphasize the costly efforts Sulṭān Zayn subsequently took, after 30 years of ongoing persecution of Hindus under his predecessors, with a view to having the Paṇḍits resettle. Zayn spent large sums of money on the re-import of much of their lost literature.<sup>21</sup> As might be expected, it is precisely

<sup>19</sup>See Ps-JRT 115\*, p. 149 (B 1082 ab): *śiśūnām śāstrapāṭhādi sūhabhaṭṭena nāśitam*.

<sup>20</sup>Cp. SLAJE 2005: 21 (n. 93). See also CHI p. 281; MAJUMDAR 1990: 431 (n. 30); WITZEL 1994b: 238; DHAR 1994: XIV, n. 24.

<sup>21</sup>See Ps-JRT 113\*, p. 146: ... *kṣmāpas tadvidyāpratyayotsukaḥ | ānāyayat sa tān sarvān paṇḍitān nijamaṇḍalam || B 1047 | ... | ... tatra yathāyogaṃ nyavīśat || B 1048 ||* ‘The Sulṭān was eager to acquaint himself with their knowledge [and so] he made all the Paṇḍits return to their home country, [...] where he made them settle down in a befitting manner’. Cp. also ŚRT I 5, 79: *purānatarkamīmāṃsāpustakān aparān api | dūrād ānāyaya vittena vidvadbhyaḥ pratyapādayat ||*. Śrīvara’s enumeration (*pāda a*) gives the impression of representing in curtailed form a Śloka found cited in full in his fellow countryman Bhaṭṭa Jayanta’s Nyāyamañjarī. There, fourteen knowledge systems are specified, among them also the four Vedas: *tānīmāni caturdaśa vidyāsthānānīty ācakṣate | yathoktam: purānatarkamīmāṃsādharmaśāstrāṅgamīśritāḥ | vedāḥ sthānāni vidyānām dharmasya ca caturdaśa iti* (NM I 8, 4ff, see also Kei Kataoka’s paper in this volume, p. ??). Thus, it is not at all improbable that Śrīvara would by his partial quotation have alluded to an import of *all* recognized Śāstras, including thereby also the (Atharva-)Veda.

in connection with Zayn's rulership that the (re-)import of the Atharvaveda is given considerable attention by Pseudo-Jonarāja. The reason for doing so clearly derives from the following:

*śāstreṣv atharvavedasya mähātmyaṃ paripaśyatām |*  
*kāśmīrikāṇaṃ tatprāptyai ciram āsīn manorathaḥ || 1269 ||*  
*kāle 'tha vipule yāte sūhabhaṭṭabhayākulaḥ |*  
*yuddhabhaṭṭābhīdho mānī deśāntaram agād guṇī || 1270 ||*  
*yajusaḥ paṭhanāt prītaiḥ karṇātaiḥ so 'tha pāṭhitah |*  
*sarahasyam atharvāṇaṃ nijāṃ pratyāgato bhuvam || 1271 ||*  
*śrījainollābhadenasya guṇino guṇarāginah |*  
*upadīkrtya taṃ vedam parāṃ tuṣṭim ajījanat || 1272 ||* Ps-JRT \*121 (p. 173), B  
 1269–1272

The people of Kaśmīr, being fully aware of the Atharvaveda's great impor-

Śrīvara may even have taken his partial citation directly from Jayanta's Nyāyamañjarī, since, according to Śuka (c. AD 1513), a good history-writer should be familiar with (typically Nyāya) issues of reasoning and raising doubts (*tarka*, *vitarka*), and should base his work on valid means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*), etc.: *vandyam tarkavitarkakausalamater vākyaṃ pramāṇānavitam yatkāntya nṛpakīrtivasturacanā dedīpyate sarvataḥ |* (ŚuRT I 4ab).

As to the source of Jayanta's Śloka, it is almost identical to YājñSm 1.3 (cp. GERSCHHEIMER forthc., notes 18 and 34). The Mitākṣarā there explains *-nyāya-* (for Jayanta's *-tarka-*) as *tarkavidyā*, so Jayanta's quote of the passage appears to be related to the Yājñavalkya-smṛti as handed down by this commentatorial tradition. Jayanta (*loc. cit.*) makes a further reference to the fourteen knowledge systems by quoting from a second source, identified as Viṣṇupurāṇa III 6, 26ff by GERSCHHEIMER (forthc., n. 34): *aṅgāni vedāś catvāro mīmāṃsā nyāyavistarāḥ | purāṇaṃ dharmasāstraṃ ca vidyā hy etāś caturdaśa ||*. However, the Viṣṇudharmottara, of Kashmirian origin, transmits the same verse (VDhP I 74, 32). Therefore, one cannot be absolutely sure from which Purāṇa Jayanta was actually citing, if he was citing from a Purāṇa at all. Interestingly, in another passage, also referred to by GERSCHHEIMER (forthc., n. 33), Jayanta categorizes the source of this very quote as 'another Smṛti' (*smṛtyantare ca spaṣṭam evoktam*, NM I 618, 21–619, 2). The immediately preceding Smṛti, directly referred to by Jayanta, is the same verse from Yājñavalkya's. In light of the clear distinction between the two categories made in this second quote (*purāṇaṃ dharmasāstraṃ ca*), it is impossible that Jayanta would himself have classed the Purāṇas with the Smṛtis. Accordingly, it is obvious that Jayanta's source must be searched for elsewhere, in fact among works classified as Smṛti, as are the Dharmasāstras and the Mahābhārata. The passage does indeed occur repeatedly in the Mahābhārata, although each occurrence has been relegated to the critical apparatus by the editors (cp., e.g., MBh I App. 66.7 pr.; XII App. 13.7 pr.). Furthermore, in the opening section of his commentary on the Mahābhārata, Nīlakaṇṭha deals with knowledge systems, the number of which he, too, considered to be fourteen (BhD p. 1, column 2, 2). We must note that at the end of his *pramāṇa* section, Jayanta, again treating of the fourteen *vidyāsthānas*, lends still more weight to this passage by citing it even a third time (NM II 258, 7f). In this connection, a reference to Kumārila's discussion of the fourteen knowledge systems (TV on I 3, 4–6) may also be of some interest. Certain traditions referred to by him (*sāṃkhya-yoga-pāñcarātra-pāśupata-śākya*, TV 112, 19f), as well as the sequence of their enumeration, undeniably have much in common with the Mahābhārata and the Viṣṇudharmottara. The enumeration in the Mahābhārata is as follows: *sāṃkhyaṃ yogaṃ pañcarātraṃ vedāḥ pāśupataṃ tathā* (MBh XII 337, 59ab; cp. also 337, 1). In the Viṣṇudharmottara, expressly in the context of a *vidyāsthāna* discussion, we find: *sāṃkhyaṃ yogaṃ pañcarātraṃ śaivaṃ pāśupataṃ tathā* (VDhP I 74, 34ab).

tance among the Śāstras, had since long desired to obtain it. After a considerable period had elapsed, the virtuous [and] respected Yuddhabhaṭṭa *emigrated, out of fear from Sūhabhaṭṭa*. As they were pleased by [his] recitation of the Yajurveda, the Karṇāṭas taught him reciting the Atharvaveda along with its secret texts. [Having mastered it, Yuddhabhaṭṭa] returned to his home country. The virtuous [and] glorious Zayn al-‘Ābidīn took delight in the meritorious. *By presenting him with this Veda*, [Yuddhabhaṭṭa] fully satisfied [the Sultān].

Clearly, Sūhabhaṭṭa’s persecutions, most probably having also brought in their wake the disappearance of the Atharvaveda, had caused Yuddhabhaṭṭa to flee from Kashmir. He returned only when Sūhabhaṭṭa was no longer a threat for Paṇḍits, after Sultān Zayn had come into power.<sup>22</sup> Sūhabhaṭṭa died during the rule of Zayn’s brother ‘Alī Šāh. Terminally ill, he passed away in AD 1417 at the latest.<sup>23</sup> From this it may safely be inferred that Yuddhabhaṭṭa did not return to the court before 1418.<sup>24</sup>

### Śiryabhaṭṭa

The account of Pseudo-Jonarāja continues by introducing another outstanding personality connected with the renewal of the Kashmirian Atharvaveda tradition, called Śiryabhaṭṭa:

*dattasvakīyavastrānnah śiryabhaṭṭo ’tha dharmavit |*  
*tenaivātharvavedam tam dvijaputrān apāṭhayat ||*  
*sā dharmiṣṭhā tu śālāsya śiryabhāṭṭasya dhīmatah |*  
*karṇāṭānām api param agamat sprṇaṇīyatām ||* Ps-JRT \*121 (p. 173), B 1273–1274  
 Thereupon the law scholar Śiryabhaṭṭa [started] teaching the sons of the twice-born *reciting the Atharvaveda by [using] exactly that [Veda copy]*<sup>25</sup> Zayn

<sup>22</sup>As long as Sūhabhaṭṭa was holding his influential position, Zayn was unable to do anything in support of the Hindus (JRT 678).

<sup>23</sup>Thus no longer than four years after ‘Alī had come to power, cp. JRT 679–680; 684d. Also from the sequential account of events in Ps-JRT p. 180f, 122\* (B 1317–1321), it becomes clear that Zayn came to power only after Sūhabhaṭṭa’s death (B 1322ff). See also HABIB / NIZAMI 1993: 751.

<sup>24</sup>There is only one more passage in the Rājataranṅiṇī, which is likely to refer to Yuddhabhaṭṭa by the name of Yodhabhaṭṭa. According to Śrīvara, a certain Yodhabhaṭṭa had been living at Zayn’s court, who had composed a perfect play mirroring the Sultān’s life, which went by the title of Zayn-Prakāśa: *deśabhāṣākavir yodhabhaṭṭaḥ śuddham ca nāṭakam | cakre jainaprakāśākhyam rājavṛttāntadarpaṇam ||* (ŚRT I 4, 38). In his *Rājānakavamaṣastuti* (composed not before AD 1471), Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha (latter half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century) refers to his grandfather Yodha as one of the former Rājānakas of Padmapura: cp. SANDERSON forthc., footnote 244. Whether or not Śitikaṇṭha’s grandfather was identical with the Yuddha-/ Yodhabhaṭṭa under consideration, they at least must have been contemporaries living in the same region.

<sup>25</sup>Anaphoric use of *tenaiva*, referring back to the Veda mentioned immediately before in B 1272c (*upadikṛtya tam vedam*), or back to Yuddhabhaṭṭa of B 1270c (‘Śiryabhaṭṭa made him teach

had been presented with by Yuddhabhaṭṭa]. He was provided with garments and food as his privately owned property. This most excellent Dharma-School of the learned Śīryabhaṭṭa later on (*param*) became attractive even to the Karṇāṭas.

From this passage, too, some important facts can be gathered, apart from the obvious impact Śīryabhaṭṭa in turn seems to have exercised on the Karṇāṭas. First, it was under Sultān Zayn that the Atharvaveda returned to Kashmir and its study had been resumed. Second, the very codex Yuddhabhaṭṭa had presented Zayn with became the basis for the instructions given by Śīryabhaṭṭa and — most likely — for subsequently copied apographs. Furthermore, compared to the preceding rulers, the situation must have had improved considerably under Zayn. The Brahmins' earlier struggle for survival had given way to traditional forms of making their living through teaching; their basic needs were satisfied by the supply of food and garments.

There are also some revealing references to Śīryabhaṭṭa in Jonarāja's and Śrīvara's contemporary chronicles. By piecing them together, we get a more comprehensive picture of Śīryabhaṭṭa's personality and fate.

At the time when Jonarāja lived at Zayn's court, Śīryabhaṭṭa was holding the highest judicial position.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, it was Śīryabhaṭṭa, who — on behalf of Zayn — commissioned Jonarāja to continue Kalhaṇa's work. Says Jonarāja himself:

*sarvadharmādihikāreṣu niyuktasya dayāvataḥ |*  
*mukhāc chrīśīryabhaṭṭasya prāpyājñām 'anavajñayā ||*  
*rājāvaliṃ pūrayituṃ samprati' ... | JRT 11–12b*

I had received orders [of the Sultān that] 'without disregard the lineage of kings had now to be completed' from the mouth of the merciful Śīryabhaṭṭa, who had been entrusted with the administration of all legal matters [...].

Thus, Śīryabhaṭṭa must have been senior to Jonarāja. Separated by some 800 Ślokas from his introductory remarks just cited, Jonarāja has left us a more detailed account of Śīryabhaṭṭa's earlier fate. It perfectly ties in with our general knowledge of the religious policy pursued by Sūhabhaṭṭa under Sikandar and 'Alī Šāh: Zayn had been suffering seriously from what appeared to be an incurable boil, and because of the oppressions by the Mlecchas no medical expert

the sons ... and provided him with his own garments ...'). The choice of words there points to a gift in physical shape, i.e. a *manuscript copy* of the Atharvaveda. Had Yuddhabhaṭṭa recited it to Zayn only from memory, we would expect a form of the verb *paṭh*, or something similar. Moreover, mere recitation could hardly have been considered a 'present'. Cp. also ŚRT I 5, 79 (quoted above in footnote 21), according to which Zayn procured *manuscripts (pustaka)* from abroad.

<sup>26</sup>Cp. also Ps-JRT 113\*, p. 148: *bhūpateḥ prāḍvivoākatvaṃ sa prāpad bhaṭṭaśīryakaḥ || B 1073cd ||* ('Śīryabhaṭṭa was promoted by the Sultān's to the office of chief judge').

had remained in the country — except for Śiryabhaṭṭa.<sup>27</sup> The latter, however, had been hiding himself:

*yajvā gārudaśāstrajñāḥ śiryabhaṭṭo nr̥pānugaiḥ |*  
*atrānviṣadbhir āpto 'tha ... ||*  
*cikitsāyām vidagdhaḥ sa mlecchabhītyā vyalambata |*  
*sphuliṅgadagdhaḥ puruṣaḥ spr̥śaty api maṇim̐ cirāt ||*  
*svayam dattābhayo rājñā prāptas tam udamūlayat |*  
*śiryabhaṭṭo viśasphoṭam ... || JRT 812–814*  
*tuṣṭena bhūbhujā dattām yatheṣṭam api sampadam |*  
*naikṣiṣṭa śiryabhaṭṭaḥ sa ... || JRT 816*

The Sultān's servants, who had been searching there for Śiryabhaṭṭa, eventually found him, a sacrificing expert in the science of antidotes. Skilled in the science of healing, he hesitated [to come along with them], for *he feared the Mlecchas*. Having been burnt by sparks of fire, a man would even touch a jewel only after a long time. After the ruler himself had guaranteed him safety, Śiryabhaṭṭa came to him, [and] removed the malignant boil [...]. The satisfied ruler offered him riches in full accordance with his wishes. Śiryabhaṭṭa, [however], refused them [...].

Like Pseudo-Jonarāja, who had noted down that 'Yuddhabhaṭṭa emigrated *out of fear from Sūhabhaṭṭa*', so also Jonarāja refers to the all-pervasive terror of Sūhabhaṭṭa's persecutions, which had led to the expulsion of medical experts from the country:

*... mleccha[... ]bādhayā |*  
*na lābho viśavaidyānām deśe 'sminn abhavat tadā || JRT 811b–d*  
*Due to the oppression of the [...] Mlecchas, no medical experts in antidotes were available at that time in this country.*

Śiryabhaṭṭa, too, had '*feared the Mlecchas*'. From evidence of that sort, preserved by different sources, it is obvious that the Paṇḍits had only had the choice between emigration and hiding themselves. Of interest in the present Atharvaṇic context, however, is Śiryabhaṭṭa's expertise in the science of antidotes and healing, as emphasized by Jonarāja, who never mentions the Atharvaveda by name. The name of the Veda is expressly referred to only by Pseudo-Jonarāja. Anyhow, Śiryabhaṭṭa's medical expertise recommended him for Zayn's court. Given the circumstances, a general desire for a re-import of the Atharvaveda<sup>28</sup> would thus come no less as a surprise to us than finding Śiryabhaṭṭa, the medical expert, mentioned as eventually teaching this Veda by using the copy Yuddhabhaṭṭa had presented to Zayn after his return from Kaṛṇāṭa, or by having him recite from it.

<sup>27</sup>JRT 810–811.

<sup>28</sup>Ps-JRT \*121 (p. 173), B 1269, cp. the quote above.

From the many passages dealing with Śiryabhaṭṭa in Pseudo-Jonarāja's text, it would appear that Śiryabhaṭṭa's refusal of the riches offered by Zayn was no exaggeration. One passage, already cited, should be recalled in this context, according to which he had been teaching the Atharvaveda expecting only supply of basic needs such as garments and food in return. Furthermore, serving under Sulṭān Zayn as a chief judge, Śiryabhaṭṭa is praised for having repaired damages and having remedied abuses caused by Sūhabhaṭṭa. Pseudo-Jonarāja depicts Śiryabhaṭṭa as the true antagonist of Sūhabhaṭṭa. By his unremitting efforts, he, however, incurred the anger of the Muslims (*yavana*):

*nāśitaṃ sūhabhaṭṭena yadyat kaśmīramaṇḍale |  
yojitaṃ śiryabhaṭṭena rājaprārthanayātha tat ||  
pravartya yāgayātrādi nāgānāṃ bhāṭṭaśiryakah |  
turuṣkāpahr̥tām bhūmiṃ vidagdebhyo nyadāpayat ||  
udaye dāpīte tena hindukānām akhaṇḍite |*

*śiryabhaṭṭāya cukupuḥ sarve yavanadānavāḥ ||* Ps-JRT 113\* (p. 146), B 1051–1053  
From that time on (*atha*), Śiryabhaṭṭa, at the request of the Sulṭān, restored again whatever had been destroyed [before] in the country of Kashmir by Sūhabhaṭṭa. Śiryabhaṭṭa first set in motion [the performance of] Nāgasacrifices, pilgrimages, etc., [and] then retransferred to the educated [Hindu community] the [ownership of the] land stolen by the Turks. After he had [their land] revenue transferred [back] in its entirety to the Hindu people (*hinduka*), all 'enemies of the gods', as were the Muslims (*yavana-dānava*),<sup>29</sup> became angry with Śiryabhaṭṭa.

In connection with Śiryabhaṭṭa's restoration of Hindu culture in the valley of Kashmir, some of the additional efforts taken by him with the approval of, or rather, by Zayn's explicit order given 'through the mouth of Śiryabhaṭṭa' (*°mukha*)<sup>30</sup> deserve note:

- Reduction of the *Ġizya*, a heavy tax levied on members of the Hindu class, to the symbolic amount of 1 silver *māṣa* only, tantamount to almost a complete abolishment of the tax.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup>There is a pun inherent here on the Brahmins as 'earthly gods'. At the same time, it may also refer to the Muslims' iconoclastic activities.

<sup>30</sup>See Ps-JRT 114\*, p. 149 (B 1078); Ps-JRT 115\*, p. 150 (B 1089); for another example of a similar expression see also JRT 11; 972.

<sup>31</sup>JRT 817cd; Ps-JRT 114\*, p. 149, B 1077f. The relevant Śloka of the shorter Śāradā version is incomplete (817a is missing). From Pāda b, with *trayadaṇḍaṃ nivārya* occurring, KAUL has inferred a tax of 3 *palas* (= 192 *māṣas*), and has therefore calculated a reduction of 99.5%. Following STEIN's note on RT IV 201–203, KAUL took 1 *pala* as equivalent to 64 *māṣas* (KAUL 1967: 105, n. 6). This ratio corresponds with the general Indian standards as given by KIRFEL (1920: 332). However, according to KIRFEL, a difference should be made between *māṣas* and silver *māṣas* (*rūpyamāṣa*). If we adapt the *raupyamāṣa* of our texts to KIRFEL's system, and accept with Pseudo-Jonarāja a *Ġizya* of 2 silver *palas* instead of three (with Jonarāja), the ratio would



- Prohibition of cattle slaughter (JRT 115\*, p. 149, B 1079).
- Restoration of traditional learning by providing a livelihood for teachers (JRT 115\*, p. 149, B 1082).
- Foundation of Colleges (*maṭha*) and Dharma-Schools (*dharmasālā*) all over the country (JRT 889).
- Bank reinforcement and regulation of the river Ledarī (JRT 121\*, p. 171, B 1245ff).

Among Śiryabhaṭṭa's moral qualifications the one of being 'a righteous person' (*dhārmika*) is most frequently emphasized. This not only ties in with the position he was holding as a chief judge, but also with his reputation of lacking greediness (*nirlobha*)<sup>32</sup> and of being incorruptible.<sup>33</sup> Still today, the name of Śiryabhaṭṭa is held in great esteem in Śrīnagar. So much so that "a locality in Zayn's capital even now bears the physician's name. 'Shiryabhata Day' is celebrated on the dark 15<sup>th</sup> of Chaitra."<sup>34</sup> Śiryabhaṭṭa had become very influential at Zayn's court. Together with him, also the Buddhist Tilakācārya had been holding a high executive post at the court, as it was the case, too, with Siṃha, the Sultān's chief auditor. In this context, it is worthy of note that influential Buddhists were still present in Kashmir in the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>35</sup> Together, all three were supporting the promotion of Brahmins to the highest positions.<sup>36</sup>

At the end of his Rājatarāṅgiṇī (JRT 970f), Jonarāja sadly commemorates Śiryabhaṭṭa's death. In doing so, he emphasizes again the lasting impact Śiryabhaṭṭa had exercised on Zayn's 'righteousness' in his capacity of an 'administrator of the law'.<sup>37</sup> Only six Ślokas further Jonarāja's chronicle breaks off. We know from his disciple Śrīvara (ŚRT I 1, 6) that this interruption had been caused by Jonarāja's unexpected death in AD 1459. So there is reason to assume that Śiryabhaṭṭa died only shortly before Jonarāja, in the late fifties of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

Let us now briefly turn to the Veda copy Yuddhabhaṭṭa had presented to Zayn,<sup>38</sup> who himself in turn placed it at Śiryabhaṭṭa's disposal, and ask ourselves, in

be 160 (*rūpyamāṣas*) : 1 (*pala*). In this case, the reduction would have been from 2 silver *palas* (= 320 *rūpyamāṣas*) to 1 *rūpyamāṣa* a year.

<sup>32</sup>See Ps-JRT 121\*, p. 171, B 1245d–1246b.

<sup>33</sup>Ps-JRT 115\*, p. 149, B 1087b: *notkocaphalam ādita* ('did not accept bribe money').

<sup>34</sup>S.L. SADHU on DUTT 1898 (p. 86, n. 189).

<sup>35</sup>On Tilakācārya see SLAJE forthc. (b).

<sup>36</sup>*sa śiryabhaṭṭas tilakah sa siṃhagaṇanāpatih | sopānāny abhavann uccapādārohe dviṅjanmanām || 824 ||.*

<sup>37</sup>*rājño dharmādhikāreṣu pratyavekṣāparaḥ sadā | mahāsrīśiryabhaṭṭo 'pi tasmin kāle divaṃ yayau || 970 || gatesv apy eṣu dharmo 'sya rājño naivālpātām gataḥ | 971ab |.*

<sup>38</sup>See above, footnote 25.

what way the Tübingen Paippalādasamhitā copy dated December, 1419 AD could be related to it.

The beginning of Zayn al-‘Ābidīn’s sultanate is conventionally given as AD 1420, thus one year *after* the dating in the manuscript’s colophon. Some confusion prevails about Zayn’s reign, mainly due to DUTT’s English translation of the later Rājatarāṅgiṇīs and to the Muslim conversions of the local Kashmiri calendar. The dates given thus differ from AD 1419, 1420, 1422 until 1470, 1472 or even 1475, as the case may be.<sup>39</sup> For achieving reliable results, it is therefore essential to turn directly to the primary Sanskrit sources.

## Two Sultāns

According to the eyewitness Śrīvara, who left us a detailed account of Zayn’s death and burial, Zayn died at the age of over 69,<sup>40</sup> in the year AD 1470,<sup>41</sup> shortly before or on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of May,<sup>42</sup> after a rule of altogether 52 years.<sup>43</sup>

This account would yield the year AD 1401 for Zayn’s birth and the year AD 1418 for his accession to the throne.<sup>44</sup> Accordingly, he would have been 17 years of age when he became Sultān. The details of Zayn’s seizure of power as rendered by Śrīvara and Pseudo-Jonarāja, however, yield April 29 or May 13, 1420.<sup>45</sup> Zayn would thus have been of the age of 19 when he became Sultān.

<sup>39</sup>Muslim sources yield the year 1422 for Zayn’s accession; see KHAN 2004: 130 (AD 1422–1472). The Persian historiographers were basing themselves on the regional Kashmiri calendar, i.e. on the Laukika era, and converted the luni-solar Laukika years into lunar Hijra years, which may account for uncertain spaces of time, cp. HASAN 2002: 477. SCHWARTZBERG, also relying on like sources, dates Zayn’s reign as from 1420 to 1475.

<sup>40</sup>*atītagaṇitaikonasaptatyabdāyusaṃ nṛpaṃ* | ŚRT I 7, 225ab (‘[The ministers mourned over (226c)] the Sultān, [whose] life-span had exceeded altogether 69 years’).

<sup>41</sup>*śaṭcatoāriṃśavarṣe ’gād divaṃ śrījainabhūpatiḥ* || ŚRT I 7, 221cd (‘Sultān Zayn ascended to heaven in the [Laukika] year [4500 and] 46 [= AD 1470]’).

<sup>42</sup>ŚRT I 7, 224d; for the quote and its translation cp. footnote 45. According to Śrīvara, Zayn’s son Hāji Khān ascended the paternal throne on May 2, 1470 AD (*hājyikhāno ’grahīd rājyaṃ sa jyaiṣṭhapratipaddine* | ŚRT II 3cd). Calculated by Karl-Heinz Golzio, letter dt. March 2, 2004.

<sup>43</sup>*dvāpañcāśatam abdān sa rājyaṃ kṛtvā sukhapradam* | ŚRT I 7, 221ab; so also *Bahāristān*, p. 59.

<sup>44</sup>Cp. also DHAR 1994: 316; 318; notes on ŚRT 223 and 227.

<sup>45</sup>Śrīvara says: *rājyaṃ śaṇṇavate varṣe jyeṣṭhe māsy agrahīn nṛpaḥ | uttarāyaṇakālānte tenaivāntardhim āsadat* || ŚRT I 7, 224 || (‘The Sultān had seized power in the month of Jyeṣṭha in the [Laukika] year [44]96 (= AD 1420). Towards midsummer [of the Laukika year 4546 (= AD 1470)], he passed away in the same [month of Jyeṣṭha]’). Ps-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT 122\*, p. 181) indicates the date of Zayn’s triumphal procession more precisely: *śukle śukle brahmaṇo ’hni rasāṅke ’bde śaśāṅkage | jayanollābhadeno ’sau rājadhanīm viveśa saḥ* || B 1324 ||. Except for the year specification *rasāṅka* ([44]96), the meaning of *pādas* ab (doubled *śukla*, *brahman* and *śaśāṅkaga*) remained opaque to me for almost two years after submission of my paper. I am very grateful to Arlo Griffiths for his determination to finding a solution. He found it himself on August 28, 2006, as the outcome of a lengthy discussion, in which Gerdi Gerschheimer participated, kindly bringing in also his expertise. In summary: *śukla* (1) equals the month’s name *śukra* (=

The year 1420 has more or less been taken for granted by historians, disregarding the discrepancy of two years. Srikanth KAUL and Kashi Nath DHAR, in 1967 and 1993 respectively,<sup>46</sup> however, became suspicious and conjectured the difference of two years might be due to an interregnum of Zayn's elder brother 'Alī Šāh, who had resigned in favour of Zayn. I think that KAUL and DHAR were right in their assumption, at least basically,<sup>47</sup> and would like to take up the matter from there, because this starting point is most promising for bringing about a solution to the problem.

It is important to note that both Jonarāja and Śrīvara regarded Zayn as the legitimate ruler of Kashmir from the time of his first succession onwards. Śrīvara refers twice to Zayn's full period of rulership. He uses the words *rājyaṃ kṛtvā* (ŚRT I 7, 221b) when speaking about Zayn's sultanate of altogether 52 years, and *prāpte rājye* (ŚRT I 7, 263b) in a verse summarizing Zayn's life. These passages are entirely unambiguous. The second reads thus:

[Although] the kingdom had become his, [he had to live in] exile outside [it]. [And had] then to wage a horrible war against [his] elder brother ['Alī Šāh].<sup>48</sup>

Jonarāja's account makes it clear that 'Alī Šāh, as he was preparing for a pilgrimage (to Mecca),<sup>49</sup> had indeed formally conferred the sultanate on his younger brother, then still bearing the name of Šāhi Khān, who initially had refused to take on the burden.<sup>50</sup>

The king ['Alī Šāh] blessed him thus: 'May you rule the kingdom for a long

---

*jyeṣṭha*). *śukla* (2), by force of sandhi, could as well stand for *aśukla*, so we would get a 'bright' or a 'dark' half of the month, as the case may be. The day of Brahmā (*brahmaṇo 'hni*) yields 'the first *tithi*', as Brahmā would preside over it as the Tithipati. If, moreover, we make the assumption that *śaśāṅka* denotes 'Monday', two dates emerge as fitting all criteria: Monday, the 29<sup>th</sup> of April (*pūrṇimānta*, *kṛṣṇapakṣa*), or the 13<sup>th</sup> of May (*amānta*, *śuklapakṣa*). Both dates have been confirmed by an independent calculation of K.-H. Golzio, based on the assumptions as above. The latter points out (letter dt. August 28, 2006) that usage of *aśukla* would strike him as rather unexpected. He would therefore be inclined to give preference to May, 13. Anyway, both dates are quite close to Zayn's day of death (2<sup>nd</sup> May), and all three may be seen as tolerably close 'towards midsummer'. Here is Griffiths' convincing translation proposal: 'In the year [numbered by] (6) flavours and (9) numerals (= [44]96), when the bright/dark [half] in [the month] Śukla (= Jyeṣṭha) had come to a Monday (*śukle [a]śukle ... śaśāṅkage*), the day of Brahmā (= 1<sup>st</sup> *tithi*), that Zayn al-'Ābidīn entered the capital.'

<sup>46</sup>KAUL 1967: 47; DHAR 1994: 317f; notes on ŚRT 226.

<sup>47</sup>KAUL's calculation of Zayn's first accession, by which he arrived at the year 1419 AD is untenable.

<sup>48</sup>*prāpte rājye pravāso bahir atha samaro 'py agrajenātikaṣṭaḥ* | ŚRT I 7, 263b.

<sup>49</sup>Mecca is indicated by the Muslim historiographers only, see Bahāristān, p. 57, n. 72; p. 59; cp. also HASAN 2002: 111, note 143.

<sup>50</sup>JRT 706.

time, being Sulṭān under the name of glorious Zayn al-‘Ābidīn.<sup>51</sup>

Having done this, ‘Alī left Kashmir, escorted by Zayn.<sup>52</sup> In fact, ‘Alī never reached his destination. Jonarāja explains that he, dissuaded on the way by advisers and affected by the inconveniences (of the *hajj*), broke off his pilgrimage, giving in to the will of his father in law, king Billadeva of Jammu.<sup>53</sup>

We do not know how long ‘Alī had really been on his way until he decided to break off the journey. However, this much is sure that in autumn of 1419, Billadeva made his son in law return to Kashmir, protected by his Jammu troops.<sup>54</sup> Zayn resigned without resistance, leaving Kashmir together with the landholding small nobility (*ṭhakkura*).<sup>55</sup> Jonarāja unmistakably says: *rājyatyāgaṃ ... vyadhāt* (714d), which cannot but mean that Zayn had indeed been considered the legitimate ruler. Thereupon the Jammu army invaded the country and although ‘Alī ascended the paternal throne, the righteous people disapproved, as Jonarāja emphasizes.<sup>56</sup> However, the weak and timid Sulṭān could not gain control over his country. In broad daylight, warlords terrorized and ransacked the people, raping the citizens’ women.<sup>57</sup> The situation became all-out anarchy. ‘Better a kingdom without a ruler, but never again such a one’ was Jonarāja’s judgement in view of the fact that the unleashed Yavanas would not even stop at the Sulṭān’s property.<sup>58</sup> Under these circumstances,

this stupid lord ruled [only] five or six months.<sup>59</sup>

Because the invasion started from Jammu in autumn 1419, and resulted in the occupation of Kashmir, the present statement allows to settle the date of the termination of ‘Alī’s reign as in spring of the following year, i.e. between March and April, 1420.

As will be recalled, Zayn had gone into exile.<sup>60</sup> Mallīk Jasrath, a Panjābī ruler who felt obliged to Zayn’s father Sikandar and who, incidentally, was the arch-

<sup>51</sup>*śrījainollābhadinākhyah suratrāṇo bhavan bhavān | ciraṃ rājyaṃ kriyād evaṃ rājāsyāśiṣaṃ abhyadhāt* || JRT 707.

<sup>52</sup>JRT 708f.

<sup>53</sup>JRT 710f. For Billadeva, cp. KAUL 1967: 102, n. 7.

<sup>54</sup>JRT 712.

<sup>55</sup>JRT 713–716. According to KAUL (1967: 103, n. 3), the ṭhakkuras were Kashmiri Muslims. In Kalhaṇa, STEIN remarks, “ṭhakkura is a title which is applied [...] to the small nobility, presumably Rājpuṭs, from the hill territories to the south of Kashmir; [...] At present the name of ṭhākur is borne in those regions by the chief cultivating class, which ranks next below the Rājpuṭs” (1900: I, p. 292 ad RT VII 290).

<sup>56</sup>JRT 717–718.

<sup>57</sup>JRT 720–724.

<sup>58</sup>*arājakaṃ varam rājyaṃ, na svāmī tādṛśaḥ punaḥ* | JRT 725f.

<sup>59</sup>*akārṣṭi pañcaśān māsān rājyaṃ sa jaḍanāyakaḥ* | JRT 727ab.

<sup>60</sup>It should be noted that Jonarāja narrates simultaneous events one after the other (possibly marked by a change of metre, see e.g. 728). Precisely this is also the case here: the account of Zayn’s fate during ‘Alī’s unhappy reign starts with Śloka 729.

enemy of ‘Alī’s protector Billadeva from Jammu, had offered shelter to Zayn.<sup>61</sup> He intended to lure ‘Alī out of Kashmir in order to defeat on him.<sup>62</sup> That it was Jasrath of all people with whom Zayn had found shelter made ‘Alī fly into a rage, quite as one would have expected. ‘Alī, flattered and spurred on by his entourage, disregarding the warnings of his frightened army, marched up.<sup>63</sup> He also neglected an urgent message from his Jammu relative who strongly advised ‘Alī not to move from his uphill position until he himself would join up with his forces, explicitly pointing to the deceitful strategies of Jasrath.<sup>64</sup> However, to no avail. All warnings cast to the winds, ‘Alī, the foolish,<sup>65</sup> took the offensive, descended with his cavalry and suffered defeat at the hands of Jasrath.<sup>66</sup> It was Jasrath himself who eventually slew ‘Alī Śāh,<sup>67</sup> capturing him directly from the battlefield.<sup>68</sup>

Having gained victory, Zayn marched back to Kashmir.<sup>69</sup> He entered Śrīnagar in triumphal procession, ‘with the approval of the righteous’.<sup>70</sup> It is precisely this second accession to the throne which can be dated exactly by the help of Śrīvara’s and Pseudo-Jonarāja’s accounts as April 29 or May 13, AD 1420.<sup>71</sup>

## Synopsis

Counting back, the chronological order of events can now be reconstructed as follows from the Sanskrit sources.

- 1470 (End of April/before 2<sup>nd</sup> May): Zayn’s **death** (at the age of over 69 years)
- ↓↓ (reign of 52 years) ↓↓
- 1420 (29<sup>th</sup> April/13<sup>th</sup> May): **2<sup>nd</sup> accession** of Zayn (procession into Śrīnagar)

<sup>61</sup>JRT 729f. Jasrath was chief of the Khokhar / Ghakkhar tribe (*khuhkara*, JRT 730b). On their terror, which has become proverbial in Kashmir, see DHAR 1994, note 1 on ŚRT I 3, 107.

<sup>62</sup>JRT 731.

<sup>63</sup>JRT 732–737.

<sup>64</sup>JRT 738–744. He seems to have taken up his position on a hill in the territory of Rājapurī / Rajaurī (STEIN note on RT VI 286); MAK No 203. Jonarāja calls the place *mudgalavyāla* (JRT 740ab), identified as Rajaurī by SADHU (note 181 in DUTT 1898: 85); see also R. SINGH (1972: 424f, note 1) on JRT 740.

<sup>65</sup>*jaḍa* (JRT 727b); *mūḍha* (JRT 746a).

<sup>66</sup>JRT 745–749.

<sup>67</sup>*baddhvā mallikajasrathena sa yadā rājāliśāhir hato ...* (ŚRT I 3, 107a).

<sup>68</sup>*baddhe raṇād āliśāhe* (ŚRT IV 142a).

<sup>69</sup>*śrījainollābhādīno ‘tha kaśmīrān ... | ... prāvīśad ...* || JRT 751.

<sup>70</sup>*satām stutyā diśām bheryā mukhāni dhvanayann ayam | paurāṇām prāṇ manaḥ paścād rājadhānīm nṛpo ‘viśat* || JRT 752.

<sup>71</sup>See above, note 45.

- 1420 (End of April/Beginning of May): ‘Alī slain in battle
- 1420 (Spring): ‘Alī leaves Śrīnagar, setting off for Rājapurī
- 1419 (Autumn): Zayn in exile      ↑↑ (6 months of ‘Alī’s interregnum) ↑↑
  - 1419 (Autumn): From Jammu to Śrīnagar, recapture of power
  - 1418/1419: Interruption of *hajj*; ‘Alī in Jammu with Billadeva
  - 1418: ‘Alī setting off for a pilgrimage to Mecca
- ↑↑ (reign of 52 years) ↑↑
- 1418 (April/May): **1<sup>st</sup> accession** of Zayn (sultanate conferred on him by ‘Alī)
  - 1417: Sūhabhaṭṭa’s death
  - 1413: ‘Alī’s accession
- 1401 (Before end of April): Zayn’s **birth**

From this reconstruction it becomes clear that Zayn had been ruling the country legitimately as Sultān *from spring 1418*, maintaining his court in Śrīnagar *until autumn 1419*, interrupted only by the 6 months of ‘Alī’s interregnum *from autumn 1419 to spring 1420*. By *May 1420 at the latest*, Zayn had already recaptured his throne. From his first accession, Zayn was considered the legitimate Sultān of Kashmir.

Thus, a Kashmirian Atharvaveda codex dating from December 1419 may absolutely be linked to Zayn as a ruler. Moreover, making such a connection is also consonant with a palaeographic development characteristic of that time. The final decline of *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā* diacritics in favor of only the *śīromātrā* manner of writing diphthongs happened in Kashmir between the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> and the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, that is, mainly in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. This chronological determination of the predominance of vowels written in the *śīromātrā* manner is of some relevance for the dating of manuscripts. Any Kashmirian codex displaying such a change will have to be dated by considering this period as the earliest possible date of its writing. The same applies to the Tübingen Atharvaveda codex, since it does reflect such a change in the writing of diphthongs. According to the colophon of the Tübingen Codex, Paṇḍit Praśastabhava would have finished his copy on a Friday, December 15, 1419, in the Ahalyā Maṭha of Śrīnagar.<sup>72</sup> Thus it was completed only three months after the beginning of ‘Alī’s short interregnum of altogether six months, during which time Zayn had been staying abroad in exile. In all likelihood, copying the full codex would have taken more than only three months, so that we must

<sup>72</sup>See WITZEL 1994a: 11f., partially quoted in footnote 10 above.

assume Praśastabhava to have started working on it when Zayn was on the throne, i.e. any time between spring 1418 and autumn 1419.

In this regard, it should be emphasized that it remains unclear whether the Tübingen codex and its colophon represent the original or rather a copy thereof. For the present concern, however, it would not make much of a difference. It is difficult to judge, and more a matter of speculation, whether Praśastabhava's manuscript was an apograph copied from, e.g., Yuddhabhaṭṭa's archetype, which the latter might have prepared himself in Śrīnagar or even brought along with him from Karṇāṭa. Yuddhabhaṭṭa's manuscript, as will be recalled, was directly handed over to the Sultān as a present. It was certainly deposited in the royal library, which was destroyed by fire decades later.<sup>73</sup> It is unlikely that an otherwise unknown Paṇḍit would have got access to that manuscript as early as 1419. Only Śīryabhaṭṭa, high-ranking as he was, was given permission to use it as a basis for teaching. I am rather inclined to assume Praśastabhava's Atharvaveda copy would indeed manifest in written form what he and his fellow students had been orally taught by Śīryabhaṭṭa in his Dharmasālā. This assumption would perhaps also better account for the innumerable problematic readings of the Tübingen codex.

However this may have been, the necessity of a re-import of the Atharvaveda into Kashmir comes as no surprise, in light of the country's late medieval history. Its presentation to Sultān Zayn by Yuddhabhaṭṭa, in the material form of a (Śāradā birch-bark) manuscript, and Śīryabhaṭṭa's post at Zayn's court as a law scholar and teacher of this very Atharvaveda, can also plausibly be explained. All these events happened in connection with the stopping of the Hindu persecutions (after Sūhabhaṭṭa's death in AD 1417) by Zayn in AD 1418, leading to the Sultān's balanced rule, uncontested from 1420 onwards.

## Postscript

Up to this point, my conclusion reached had been centred on a seemingly hard fact consisting in the dating of the Tübingen Paippalādasamhitā manuscript, which was considered unshakable.<sup>74</sup> After completion of the present article, however, substantial doubt arose about the reliability of the calculations carried out so far, as their very basis appeared to be far from secure. Briefly, two main points are at issue in this regard. One is the actual reading of the colophon, and the second is the system of reckoning used by the scribe.

Let us look at the colophon first. The decisive passage can be verified in the facsimile reproduction of BLOOMFIELD / GARBE (1901: III) on folio 287b, lines 8–10. BARRET (1940: 152f) transcribed the lines as follows:

<sup>73</sup>WITZEL 1994a: 16.

<sup>74</sup>See above, p. 2 (note 10).

*ahlāmaṭṭheyamayāpaṃ praśastabha[9]vena merabhavaputreṇotsabhavapāutrena atharvaṇavedaṃ likhitam. z z [10] saṃvat 95 [remarks and notes by BARRET] mārg\*\*\*ati trayodaśāṃ śukravāsare \*\*\*\*\* [11]*

WITZEL's transcription (1994a: 11f.) and separation of words differ in some parts from that of BARRET:

*ahlāmaṭṭheya mayā paṃ praśasta-Bhavana Merabha-putreṇOtsava Bhava-pautreṇā atharvaṇavedaṃ likhitam. z z saṃvat 95 mārga [ś]uti trayodaśāṃ śukravāsare z [\*\*\*\*\*]*

Below his transcription, WITZEL added a "slightly 'corrected' reading", thus aiming at making the lines intelligible:

Ahlamaṭṭheya- (mayā) Paṃḍita-Praśasta-Bhavana Mīra-Bhava-putra-Utsava-Bhava-pautreṇa-Atharvaṇavedaṃ likhitam || Saṃvat 95 Mārga-śukla-tithau trayodaśāyāṃ śukravāsare |

The only major difference between BARRET's and WITZEL's transcriptions, as far as the dating of the manuscript is concerned, is *\*ati* (BARRET) against *\*uti* (WITZEL), resulting in *[v]ati* or *[ś]uti*, as the case may be. The asterisks indicate that the brittle birch-bark has peeled off and the syllables written on it have become irretrievably lost. From an inspection of the facsimile edition, it would appear that WITZEL's reading *[ś]uti* is perhaps more accurate, for at the bottom of the line there has indeed remained something like a hook pointing to the left, the common diacritic sign representing a subscribed *-u*. Neither of the transcriptions is, however, absolutely faithful to the manuscript. The actual reading of the two lines (with a tentative word separation) is this:

[8] ... *ahlāmaṭṭheya mayā paṃ praśastabha[9]vena merabhavaputreṇotsabhavapautreṇa atharvaṇavedaṃ likhitam. z z [10] saṃvat 95 mārg\* \*ti trayodaśāṃ śukravāsare \*\*\*\*\**

Largely following WITZEL's proposal, the meaning underlying this wording may perhaps be recognized by the following reconstruction:

*ahlāmaṭṭha iya[m]<sup>75</sup> mayā paṃ[ḍitena] praśastabhavena mīrabhavaputreṇotsabhavapautreṇa [ā]tharvaṇavedaṃ likhitam. z z [laukika]saṃvat 95 mārga[śīrṣe] [ś](u)[kla]ti[thau] trayodaś[y]āṃ śukravāsare.*

The present Atharvaveda was written by me, Paṃḍit Praśastabhava, son of Mīrabhava, grandson of Utsabhava, in the Ahalyā College on a Friday, the thirteenth lunar day of the bright half in the month of Mārgaśīrṣa of the common local year 95.

<sup>75</sup> Assuming irregular double sandhi (°maṭṭha [locative] + i°) and gender confusion (*iyam*, fem. + °vedaṃ likhitam, irregular neuter).



Alternatively, when reading [*va*]ti (= *vahula-tithau*) instead of [*śu*]ti (= *śukla-tithau*), which, however, means ignoring the possible fragment of a left-hand hook below a lost syllable, we would get the meaning ‘dark fortnight’.

All previous calculations carried out by Claus VOGEL had taken *vati* (“dark fortnight”) as their starting-point and thus resulted in Friday, December 15, 1419, as the only possible dating. In fact, as WITZEL himself again confirmed in 1994, only *vati* would “fit all criteria”. Therefore, it must be assumed, he kept to “dark fortnight” in discussing this colophon, the reading of which he had reconstructed as [*ś*]uti. Accepting the newly proposed reading *śuti* would indeed create an almost insoluble problem. The implausibility of *śuti*, from the point of view of calculation, has become clear from a private discussion investigating the consequences of such an assumption, as well as from a further remark made by WITZEL, according to which the dating in the manuscript follows the *amānta* scheme. Summarizing the fresh calculations experts on Indian calendar reckoning (J.C. Eade, K.-H. Golzio and Michio Yano) were kind enough to carry out, by way of trial, the matter now presents itself as follows.

In Kashmir, both methods of counting the lunar months were in use, one system beginning with the full moon (*pūrṇimānta*), and the other one beginning with the new moon (*amānta*). This fact should be emphasized, as it stands in sharp contrast to the general opinion, according to which in Kashmir, as a northern area, the *pūrṇimānta* scheme alone would have prevailed.<sup>76</sup> Thus, WITZEL’s statement that the Atharvaveda dating was based on the *amānta* reckoning is plausible. On the other hand, there would be no difference between the *amānta* and *pūrṇimānta* reckonings in case a lunar day of the bright fortnight (*śuti*) was indeed concerned.<sup>77</sup> Therefore, WITZEL’s remark on the *amānta* use makes sense only if a dark fortnight (*vati*) was considered by him.

Test calculations carried out by K.-H. Golzio on the basis of *pūrṇimānta* and a Friday as a thirteenth waxing day (*śuti*) yielded AD 1719, 30 October (Old Style) = 10 November (New Style) as the only result; *śuti* on the basis of *amānta* resulted in Friday, 13 November 1019. As neither the 11th nor the 18th centuries appear to be reasonable alternatives, *śuti* should indeed be ruled out as a possible reading. The issue turned out to become much more convincing as soon as a Friday as thirteenth waning day (*vati*) according to *amānta* reckoning was taken as the starting-point for another series of calculations. Two matching results could be achieved by M. YANO: Friday, 6 December 1219 and Friday, 15 December 1419. However, the mentioned Maṭha on the bank of the Vitastā, ru-

<sup>76</sup>Cp. SALOMON (1998: 177): “[...] months [...] counted as ending with the full moon (*pūrṇimānta*, the “northern” system) or the new moon (*amānta*, the “southern” system)”; (1998: 197): “Years of the Saptarṣi cycle are usually denoted as current and *caitrādi*; the months are *pūrṇimānta*.” For evidence clearly contradicting this statement and testifying to the use also of the *amānta* system in Kashmir, see KIELHORN (Kleine Schriften II [1969]: 619; 621) and YANO 1994: 223ff; 230 (*amānta* in use, e.g., in the *Nīlamatapūrāṇa*, by Bhaṭṭotpala, the astronomer; *pūrṇimānta* used by Kalhaṇa).

<sup>77</sup>See table 3 of YANO 1994: 227.

ined during Raṅjit Singh's Sikh rule by the conflagration of AD 1833/34,<sup>78</sup> was founded by King Lakṣmadeva's queen Ahalā only some time between AD 1273 and 1286.<sup>79</sup> Therefore, the year 1219 can safely be ruled out. Considering the additional evidence externally supplied from the Rājatarāṅgiṅīs, strongly supporting the 15<sup>th</sup> century, I think it is absolutely justified to suggest the reading *vati*, accept *amānta* as the scheme of reckoning, and maintain Claus VOGEL's original calculation as the safest of all hypotheses: Friday, 15 December 1419.

## Post-Postscript

Of late, I chanced upon two stanzas by Pseudo-Jonarāja, which may be considered another piece of evidence supportive of the year 1419. As will be recalled, Praśastabhava, the scribe of the Tübingen codex, has left us the name of his grandfather in the colophon as Utsabhava (see above, p. 18), which is certainly no frequent proper name and also no familiar short form of Utsava. It turns out that Pseudo-Jonarāja knew of a Brahmin (*bhaṭṭa*) namesake, who was one of Sūhabhaṭṭa's henchmen. The event related by Pseudo-Jonarāja happened shortly after 'Alī Šāh's succession in 1413, approximately six years before Praśasta-bhava's copying of the codex was completed. In light of the cumulative evidence collected so far, Praśasta-bhava's grandfather and Bhaṭṭa Sūha's cunning follower may indeed have been one and the same person.

This is the background of the event. Immediately after 'Alī's accession to the throne (1413), Bhaṭṭa Sūha ensured his promotion to the position of Prime Minister (JRT 816). Having achieved this, he set himself to the elimination of his former fellow ministers, who had served together with him under 'Alī's father Sulṭān Sikandar as close confidants, Laddarāja and Śāṅkara, the physician (JRT 585). Laddarāja held the position of *mārgapati*, a commander-in-chief of the mountain passes. Arresting him publicly was out of the question, as Sūha had drunk the peace cup with Ladda (*kośapāna*).<sup>80</sup> To the public, he was bound to stand by his oath unswervingly. Moreover, Sūha was a coward shying away

<sup>78</sup>*ahalyāmaṭhe 'gnidāhaḥ saṃpannaḥ sahasraśaś ca gṛhā [...] dagdhā abhūvan [...] saṃvat 1890. Sāhibrām, Rājatarāṅgiṅīsāṅgraha, Ms Stein no 130, fol. 54<sup>r</sup> (original numbering: 12<sup>v</sup>), ll. 2–6. See CLAUSON 1912: 598. On fol. 41<sup>v</sup>, STEIN notes: "Miscellaneous Notes and Verses composed by Pt. Sahibram, possibly for his continuation of the Rājatarāṅgiṅī. Copied in August 1891 from the author's autograph through Pt. Sahajabhaṭṭa. Lahore: 3.1.1891. M. A. Stein."*

<sup>79</sup>*vītatāyās taṭe śvaśrūmathopānte mathaṃ navam | niṣpaṅkā nījanāmāṅkam ahalāmahiṣī vyadhāt ||* JRT 115.

<sup>80</sup>Drinking the water of a peace cup was to the (Kashmiri) Indians what smoking the peace pipe was to the American Indians. Kalhaṇa's references to this custom have been exhaustively treated by KÖLVER (1971: 175ff). In the present context the following passage is of relevance: *adrohārthitatatsaṃvoitpītakośodako 'pi san || laddamārgapatim sūhabhaṭṭo roddhum acintayat || tena hy aśāṅki sa svasmin svātmevāsmīn hy aviśvasan | mahātmanām bhavet kośaḥ kośo vāri tu pāpinām ||* Ps-JRT 98\* (p. 114), B 793–794 ('Although Bhaṭṭa Sūha had drunk the peace cup [with him], well aware that trustworthiness was the aim [of the oath], he plotted to take him into captivity. For,

from face-to-face fighting.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, he sent a henchman, Utsa, to Ladda's palace chamber, under a pretext. And while Utsa was inside, he had the building surrounded by assassins (*tīkṣṇa*).

This is Pseudo-Jonarāja's account of Bhaṭṭa Utsa(va):

*śrutvā tadgamanam dūtān mantranirbhedaśaṅkitaḥ |*  
*laddamārgapatiṃ roddhuṃ sahasā samacintayat ||*  
*rujaḥ saṃvīkṣaṇavyājān mārgeśasya śayāptaye<sup>82</sup> |*  
*viśvāsanāya ca prāsyad bhaṭṭotsaṃ tasya sadmani ||*  
*cikitsakauṣadhāhārī mārgeśatimināḍṛtaḥ |*

*nābodhi piṇḍīnirgūḍhabaḍīsaṃ punar utsavaḥ ||* Ps-JRT 99\* (p. 116), B 816c–818  
 [...] When [Sūha] had learned from [his] messenger that [Ladda's son Muḥammad] had disappeared, he suspected his scheme might have been exposed [and] immediately decided to imprison Ladda. He sent Bhaṭṭa Utsa to [Ladda's], the Mārgapati's house under the pretext of looking after [his] poor health.<sup>83</sup> This should get [Utsa] close to [Ladda's] bed and [at the same time] inspire confidence [in him]. [Utsa was a] cautious [man and so, to arouse as little suspicion as possible,] brought medicaments along with him. The Mārgapati, [like a] *timi* fish, neither recognized [the] fish-hook inside the pill nor<sup>84</sup> did he see through Utsava, [the angler].

## Literature

*Bahāristān* (*Bahāristān-i Šāhī*)

Bahāristān-i-Shāhī. A chronicle of Mediaeval Kashmir. K.N. PANDIT [Translator]. Calcutta 1991.

Barret, Leroy Carr

1940 The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Books nineteen and twenty. New Haven.

Basham, A.L.

1948 Harṣa of Kashmir and the Iconoclast Ascetics. In: BSOAS 12, 688–691.

he was suspicious about Ladda. [Sūha] distrusted him quite as he would [have distrusted] himself. A peace cup is a peace cup for noble souls [only]. It is water, however, to the depraved').

<sup>81</sup>*kātaro vīravīdveṣī nirguṇo guṇimatsaraḥ | dūḍhaḥ kulīnaḥ kaulīno vidhātraiva hi nirmitaḥ ||* [Ps-JRT 98\* (p. 114), B 795] ('The creator has created the cruel, high-born Kaula Brahmin [Sūha] as cowardly, averse to bravery, destitute of virtues, and envious of the meritorious').

<sup>82</sup>*mārgeśasya śayā° D B] mārgeśasyāśayā°* (Ed.)

<sup>83</sup>Ladda must have suffered from a disease at that time, or else this remark is to be understood with reference to Ladda's infirmity, see above Ps-JRT 98\* (p. 115), B 809b: *mantrī mārgapatir jaran* ('The counsellor, chief commander of the mountain passes, has grown old').

<sup>84</sup>Construe *nābodhi* ... [*nābodhi*] *punar* (SPEIJER §§ 407, 448).

**BhD** (Nīlakaṇṭha: Bhāratabhāvadīpa)

Mahābhāratam with the Commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha. 1. Ādiparva. Poona 1929.

Bloomfield, Maurice / Richard Garbe

1901 The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (School of the Paippalādas). Reproduced by Chromatography from the Manuscript in the University Library at Tübingen. 3 parts. Baltimore.

Bühler, G.

1877 Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Mss made in Kaśmir, Rajputana, and Central India. Bombay.

**CHI**

The Cambridge History of India. Vol. III. Turks and Afghans. Ed. by Sir Wolseley HAIG. Cambridge 1928. Reprint New Delhi 1987.

Clauson, Gerard L.M.

1912 Catalogue of the Stein Collection of Sanskrit MSS. from Kashmir. In: JRAS 1912, 587–627.

Dhar, Kashi Nath

1994 Śrīvara's Zaina Rājatarāṅgiṇī. English translation and annotations. New Delhi.

Dutt, J.C.

1898 Medieval Kashmir. Being a reprint of the Rajataranginis of Jonaraja, Shrivara and Shuka, as transl. into Engl. by J. C. Dutt and publ. in 1898 A.D. under the title "Kings of Kashmir", Vol. III. Ed. with notes, etc., by S.L. SADHU. New Delhi 1993.

Gerschheimer, Gerdi

forthc. Les "Six doctrines de spéculation" (*ṣaṭṭarkī*). Sur la catégorisation variable des systèmes philosophiques dans l'Inde classique.

Griffiths, Arlo

2002 Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition. In: Ātharvaṇā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition). Ed. by Abhijit GHOSH. Kolkata: 35–54.

Habib, M. / K.A. Nizami

1993 A Comprehensive History of India. Vol. 5,2: The Delhi Sultanate AD 1206–1526. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bombay.

Hasan, Mohibbul

2002 Kashmir under the Sultans. Ed. Hamid NASSEM. Srinagar.

**JRT** (Jonarāja: Rājatarāṅgiṇī)

— The Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa. Ed. by DURGĀPRASĀDA, son of Vrajalāla. Vol. III, containing the supplements to the work of Jonarāja, Śrīvara and Prājyabhaṭṭa. Ed. by P. PETERSON. [Bombay Sanskrit Ser. 54.] Bombay 1896.

- Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Jonarāja. Ed. with text comparative and critical annotations and an elaborate introduction by Srikanth KAUL. [Vishveshvaranand Inst. Publ. 432 = Woolner Indological Ser. 7]. Hoshiarpur 1967.
- Rājatarāṅgini of Jonarāj. Transl., with crit. ... notes in Hindi by Raghunath SINGH. [The Jaikrishnadas-Krishnadas Prachyavidya Granthamala 4]. Varanasi 1972.
- Kaul, Srikanth**  
1967 Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Jonarāja. Ed. with text comparative and critical annotations and an elaborate introduction by Srikanth KAUL. [Vishveshvaranand Inst. Publ. 432 = Woolner Indological Ser. 7]. Hoshiarpur.
- Khan, Iqtidar Alam**  
2004 Gunpowder and Firearms. Warfare in Medieval India. [Aligarh Historians Society Series.] New Delhi.
- Kirfel, Willibald**  
1920 Die Kosmographie der Inder nach den Quellen dargestellt. 2. Nachdr. der Ausgabe Bonn und Leipzig 1920. Hildesheim etc. 1990.
- Kölver, Bernhard**  
1971 Textkritische und philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājatarāṅgiṇī des Kalhaṇa. [VOHD, Suppl. 12] Wiesbaden.
- Majumdar, A.K.**  
1990 The Delhi Sultanate. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (first publ. 1960). [The History and Culture of the Indian People.] Bombay.
- MAK**  
Yasuke IKARI, Map of Ancient Tīrthas in Kashmir Valley. In: A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir. Ed. by Yasuke IKARI. Kyoto 1994: 425–442.
- MBh (Mahābhārata)**  
The Mahābhārata. For the first time critically edited by V. S. SUKTHANKAR and others. 19 vols. Poona 1927–1959.
- NM (Bhaṭṭa Jayanta: Nyāyamañjarī)**  
Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa. Ed. by K.S. VARADACHARYA. 2 Vols. [University of Mysore, Oriental Research Institute Series. 116, 139]. Mysore 1969–1983.
- Ps-JRT (Pseudo-Jonarāja: Rājatarāṅgiṇī), in: JRT.**
- RT (Kalhaṇa: Rājatarāṅgiṇī)**  
Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. Chronicle of the kings of Kaśmīr. Sanskrit text with crit. notes. Ed. by M.A. STEIN. Bombay 1892.
- Salomon, Richard**  
1987 Notes on the Translations of Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī (I–IV). In: Berliner Indologische Studien 3, 149–179.

- 1998 Indian Epigraphy. [South Asia Research.] New York.
- Sanderson, Alexis  
 forthc. Religion and the State: Initiating the Monarch in Śaivism and the Buddhist Way of Mantras.
- Schwartzberg, Joseph E. (ed.)  
 1992 A Historical Atlas of South Asia. 2<sup>nd</sup> impression with additional material. New York.
- Singh, Raghunath  
 1972 Rājatarangini of Jonarāj. Transl., with crit. ... notes in Hindi. [The Jaikrishnadas-Krishnadas Prachyavidya Granthamala 4]. Varanasi 1972.
- Slaje, Walter  
 2004 Medieval Kashmir and the Science of History. [The University of Texas at Austin, Madden Lecture 2003-4]. Austin.  
 2005 Kaschmir im Mittelalter und die Quellen der Geschichtswissenschaft. Essay mit Anmerkungen. In: IJ 48, 1-70.  
 2006 Yājñavalkya-*brāhmaṇas* and the Early Mīmāṃsā. In: Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta. Ed. by J. Bronkhorst. Delhi 2006, 115-158.  
 forthc. (a) A Note on the Genesis and Character of Śrīvara's so-called Jaina-rājataranḡiṇī. In: JAOS.  
 forthc. (b) The Last Buddhist of Kashmir. As Recorded by Jonarāja. *Sanskrit Studies* 2 (2007).
- Speijer, J.S.  
 1886 Sanskrit Syntax. With an introduction by H. KERN. Reprint, Delhi: 1980.
- ŚRT (Śrīvara: Rājataranḡiṇī)  
 — Rājataranḡiṇī of Śrīvara and Śuka. Ed., critically, and annotated with text-comparative data from original manuscripts and other available materials by Srikanth KAUL. [Vishveshvaranand Inst. Publ. 398 = Woolner Indological Ser. 8]. Hoshiarpur 1966.  
 — Jaina-Rajatarangini of Srivara. Transl. with crit. ... notes in Hindi by Raghunath SINGH. Pt. 1.2. [Chaukhamba Amarabharati Granthamala 11]. Varanasi 1977.
- Stein, Marcus Aurel  
 1900 Kalhaṇa's Rājataranḡiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr. Transl., with an introd., comm. and app. Vol. I. II. Westminster.
- ŚuRT (Śuka: Rājataranḡiṇī), see: ŚRT.
- TV (Kumārila: Tantravārttika)  
 Śrīmajjaiminipraṇīte mīmāṃsādarśane ... °kumārilaḥḥapraṇī-tatantravārtika° ... etat pustakaṃ Gaṇeśaśāstrī Jośī ... punaḥ saṃśodhitam. Tṛtīyaṃ saṃskaraṇam. [Ānandāśramasaṃskṛta-granthāvaliḥ 97.] Puṇyākhyapattane 1981.

**VDhP** (Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa)

The Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇam. Delhi: Nag Publ. 1985.

## Witzel, Michael

- 1985 Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Samhitā. In: ZDMG, Supplementband VI, 256–271.
- 1990 On Indian Historical Writing: The Role of Vaṃśāvalīs. In: Journal of the Japanese Association of South Asian Studies 2, 1–57.
- 1994a Kashmiri Manuscripts and Pronunciation. In: A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir. Ed. by Yasuke IKARI. Kyoto: 1–53.
- 1994b The Brahmins of Kashmir. In: A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir. Ed. by Yasuke IKARI. Kyoto: 237–294.

**YājñasM** (Yājñavalkyasmṛti)

Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yogīśwara Yājñavalkya. With the Mitākṣarā Commentary of Vijnāneśvara. Ed. ... by Umesh Chandra PĀNDEY. 3rd ed. Vol. I. [Kashi Sanskrit Series. 178.] Varanasi 1983.

## Yano, Michio

- 1994 Calendar and Related Subjects in the Nīlamatapurāṇa. In: A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir. Ed. by Yasuke IKARI. Kyoto: 223–236.

