

Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 76 (2022)

Heft: 3

Artikel: Jonarja as commentator : specialized literature, philological effort, and poetic interpretation

Autor: Livio, Chiara

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1035033>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 26.04.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Chiara Livio*

Jonarāja as commentator: specialized literature, philological effort, and poetic interpretation

<https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2022-0007>

Received April 11, 2022; accepted November 13, 2022; published online December 22, 2022

Abstract: The historian Jonarāja (Kashmir, fifteenth century) is known mainly for his chronicle of the kings of Kashmir, the *Dvitiyā Rājatarāṅginī*, a continuation of Kalhaṇa’s chronicle up to the Muslim Sultanate of Zayin al-’Ābidīn (r. 1419/20–1470). However, Jonarāja also authored the commentaries of three court poems (*mahākāvya*s), namely Bhāravi’s *Kirātārjunīya*, Maṅkha’s *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, and Janaka’s *Prthvīrājaviṇaya*. The present article aims at providing a closer look at Jonarāja’s commentarial strategies, focusing on four cantos (4, 5, 6, and 17) of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. First, some examples of how Jonarāja employed specialized literature are presented, particularly quotations from grammar (*vyākaraṇa*) and Sanskrit dictionaries (*kośas*). Second, Jonarāja’s philological attempt at restoring Maṅkha’s root text (*mūla*) is addressed and subsequently analyzed based on the available manuscripts. Lastly, some common concepts contained in Maṅkha’s *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and Bhāravi’s *Kirātārjunīya* are explored to evaluate how Jonarāja comments on similar verses, and to draw some preliminary conclusions on the style and personal interpretation of the commentator.

Keywords: commentary; Jonarāja; Maṅkha; *mahākāvya*; *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*

1 Jonarāja in context

The fifteenth-century author Jonarāja is known mainly for his history of the kings of Kashmir (*Dvitiyā-Rājatarāṅginī*), a follow-up to Kalhaṇa’s *Rājatarāṅginī* up to the sultanate of Zayin al-’Ābidīn (r. 1419/20–1470), patron of the author himself. Jonarāja writes in Sanskrit about past Hindu rulers for an “evolving elite audience” of Muslims,¹ becoming an important link between Hindu culture and the Islamic

¹ Obrock 2015: 73.

*Corresponding author: Chiara Livio, University of Bologna – DISCI, Via Zamboni 33, 40126 Bologna Emilia Romagna, Italy, E-mail: chiara.livio.1991@gmail.com. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1219-1775>

leadership of Kashmir.² The *Dvitiyā Rājatarāṅgiṇī* is, indeed, a most successful example of merging two co-existing worlds, and succeeds in negotiating “a new place for Sanskrit in changed political, social, and religious contexts”.³ Zayin’s patronage, however, not only contributed to preserving the history of Kashmir, but also saved many literary works that might have been lost to time. In his career among the court literati, Jonarāja, too, played a role in securing the tools for understanding one of the most sophisticated literary genres in Sanskrit, namely court poems (*mahākāvyas*). Under Zayin’s rule, Jonarāja commented on three *mahākāvyas*: the *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi (VII CE, abb. KA),⁴ the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* of Maṅkha (1140/1144 CE, abb. ŚKC),⁵ and the *Prthvīrājavijaya* of Janaka (1192 CE). Regarding these court poems, as Luther Obrock has observed,⁶ Jonarāja “insists that his commentary provides only the synonymous syntactically simple meaning (*paryāyamātra*)”⁷ and “deals only with the literal meaning (*vācyārthamātravivṛttiṃ*)”⁸ to present the images of the verses in the most effective and intelligible way. In Maṅkha’s *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, for instance, Jonarāja makes use of specialized literature to clarify obscure passages; offers philological observations on unclear verses and, occasionally, variants of such verses; and becomes a “reliable guide for construction and meaning”⁹—not only for contemporaries of Jonarāja, but for the modern scholar as well.

The present paper aims to provide the reader with a preliminary look at Jonarāja’s commentarial strategies, focusing on his commentary on four cantos of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*.¹⁰ First, some examples of the “specialized literature”¹¹ Jonarāja employs in these four cantos are presented, particularly his quotations from grammar (*vyākaraṇa*), Sanskrit dictionaries (*kośas*), and other *mahākāvyas*.¹² Secondly, Jonarāja’s philological efforts in restoring Maṅkha’s root text (*mūla*) are studied by comparing the commentator’s proposed variants with those of the

² Obrock 2015: 72–90.

³ Obrock 2015: 72–73.

⁴ I rely on Bhatt 2013 for the transcription of Jonarāja’s commentary of the *Kirātārjunīya*. Bhatt’s work, however, is not complete, and only the first three cantos are said to be critically edited. Further work and a new critical edition of Jonarāja’s commentary to the KA is still a desideratum.

⁵ Jonarāja’s commentary to the entire *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* is edited and published by Durgaprasad and Parab in the *Kāvyamālā* printed editions (see References, Eds. = KM 1887, KM 1900, and KM 1983.)

⁶ Obrock 2015: 76.

⁷ Obrock 2015: 78.

⁸ Obrock 2015: 79.

⁹ Slaje 2015: 33.

¹⁰ These are the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventeenth cantos (*sarga*) of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, which I translated and critically edited for my PhD dissertation (unpublished).

¹¹ Klebanov 2020: 513.

¹² The present paper will not discuss how Jonarāja treats figures of speech (*śabdārthālaṃkāras*), which will be addressed in future work.

manuscripts. Third, some recurrent themes are explored to assess Jonarāja's style and his personal interpretation of similar verses in Maṅkha's *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*.

2 Jonarāja and the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*: quotations

The only published commentary of Jonarāja is his *vivṛti* on the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* of Maṅkha (twelfth century), though a critical edition still lacks.¹³ In 25 cantos (*sargas*), the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* describes the deeds of Śiva, namely his attempts to eradicate the three demons of Tripura, who threaten to conquer the three worlds.¹⁴ The action itself is confined to the second half of the poem, while the greater part of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* consists of lengthy descriptions (*varṇanas*), in line with the typical, established requirements of a *mahākāvya*.

Jonarāja tries to simplify these eloquent and baroque descriptions by means of a commentary that addresses only the literal meaning (*vācyārthamātra*) of the verses; additional interpretations and personal considerations are usually kept to a minimum, and the question of *rasa/dhvani* seems to be ruled out by the commentator.

Some notable examples of Jonarāja's conciseness are found in the commentator's interpretation of a passage of the seventeenth canto of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. In this section, Maṅkha dedicates sixteen verses to a devotional and philosophical hymn (*stuti* or *stotra*) to Śiva and mentions the ideas of various philosophical currents, which the author either refutes or includes in his own *advaita* views.¹⁵ Here Jonarāja is forced to abandon the simple, literal meaning of the words to embark on a deeper explanation of the verses. In one case, for instance, Maṅkha states that those who do not believe that Śiva is the ultimate agent of creation and maintenance of the cosmos are complete fools (*mūḍhā*; see 17.20 below). These "fools", namely those who think that nature itself (*prakṛti*) is the agent, are not explicitly named in the *mūla* text, so Jonarāja makes it explicit to his readers:

*dhiṁ mūḍhā vitatham udāsanāsvabhāvaṁ
bhāṣante puruṣa tava trilokabhartuḥ |
kartrī cet prakṛtir iyaṁ karotu kiṁcit
kaivalyaṁ bhavadadhiroham antareṇa || ŚKC 17.20 ||*

¹³ Obrock 2015: 76.

¹⁴ For studies dedicated solely to the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, see Kreyenborg 1929, Bhatt 1973, Mandal 1991, Slaje 2015, Obrock 2015, Gomez 2016, Livio 2018, Livio 2019, and Livio 2020.

¹⁵ See Livio 2020.

O Puruṣa, shame on those fools who wrongly state that your essence,
you who are the sustainer of the three worlds, is inactive;
if this Nature [really] is the agent, let's see
if she can do anything in a liberated state without leaning on you!¹⁶

J. comm. [...] *etena sāmkyamataṃ nirākṛtam | te hi sattvarajastamaḥsāmyāvasthālakṣaṇāyāḥ prakṛteḥ kartṛtvam manyante ||*

Transl. [...] With this, the Sāṃkhya's belief is refuted. These [fools], indeed, think that *prakṛti* is essentially the agent due to its being characterized by the equilibrium of *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*.

Inevitably, Jonarāja expands on the concept of the Sāṃkhya's *triguṇa*, showing that he cannot always limit his commentary to word meaning. Though illustrating his general knowledge of philosophical doctrines, however, he does not delve into a theological discussion as other commentators might. In this sense, he upholds the goal of simplicity declared at the beginning of his commentary.

On the same occasion, Maṅkha presents the doctrines of some “Buddhists” (*bauddha*° in ŚKC 17.24 and ŚKC 17.25), which he subsumes under the higher doctrine of non-dual Śaivism. Jonarāja identifies these Buddhists as Vijñānavādins and Śūnyavādins ([...] *bauddhair api vijñānavādibhir* [...] comm. J. ad ŚKC 17.24, and [...] *taiḥ śūnyavādibhir bauddhais* [...], comm. J. ad ŚKC 17.25), but engages in philosophical discussion only insofar as the meaning of the actual verses is concerned. For instance, the commentator briefly explains what these groups believe in terms of knowledge (*jñāna*) and void (*śūnyatā*), though he neither mentions the names of their most famous exponents, nor does he cite passages from their works to endorse his own interpretation of the verses.

Even when presenting word-by-word explanations, Jonarāja is concise. Like all commentators on court poems, he faces the task of explaining some peculiarities of the poet's diction, such as the use of an obsolete vocabulary (or one perceived as such by the commentator) and unusual grammatical forms. This requires Jonarāja to make use of a learned support system to justify the poet's stylistic choices.

For the sections of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* discussed in the present study, one notices that Jonarāja's primary sources are two of the most traditional works on grammar (*vyākaraṇa*) and vocabulary (*kośas*): Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Amarakośa* (i.e., Amarasimha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*), respectively.

In the printed edition (see Eds. in References), Pāṇini's *sūtras* are set off with inverted commas by the editors, but Jonarāja himself never explicitly mentions the title “*Aṣṭādhyāyī*”. This is typical of many commentaries, and Jonarāja conforms to such tradition, as in the following example:

¹⁶ Unless specified, translations from the Sanskrit are my own.

*bhaktyā natena purato 'vanicumbimūrdhnā
puṣpotkaraṃ vikratā vanamālayaiva |
daityāriṇā caraṇayoḥ kacameghavidyud-
oghair **adāyīṣata** yasya balipradīpāḥ || ŚKC 5.3 ||*

The lanterns for the oblation were offered at His feet by [Viṣṇu],
the demons' enemy, through the abundance of flashing thunder
coming from the clouds on [his] hair, [he who], bowed down in devotion,
[his] head kissing the ground before [him], was scattering petals
from the very blossoms on [his] forest-flower garland.

J. comm. [...] 'syasicsīyuttāsiṣu–' iti ciṇvadiḍ āgamaḥ [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6.4.62: *syasicsīyuttāsiṣu bhāvakarmaṇor upadeśe 'jjhanagrahadṛśāṃ vā ciṇvad iṭ ca.*

"An *aṅga*, namely *han* 'to kill', *grah* 'to seize, hold' and *dṛś* 'to see', and also that which ends in a vowel in *upadeśa* 'initial citation', is optionally treated like an *aṅga* occurring before affix *Ciṇ*, when *sya*, *sIC*, *sīyUT* and *tāsi*, with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' or *karman* 'object' with a concurrently introduced augment *iT* follows".¹⁷

In Maṅkha's verse:¹⁸ *adāyīṣata*, third-person plural of the aorist of the verb $\sqrt{dā}$ used in the passive voice, with *i* added optionally, in place of the more common *adiṣata*.

It is not surprising that any learned Indian audience would have known Pāṇini's work and needed no further details on the provenance of the grammatical *sūtras*, as Jonarāja's frequent use of Pāṇini's work reveals (see Appendix A).

Even when introducing quotations from the *Amarakośa* (see Appendix B), Jonarāja is reserved and does not employ the expected formula "Amara says" (*iti amaraḥ*), as used by other commentators.¹⁹ On the contrary, he is keener on the phrase "the dictionary says" (*iti koṣaḥ*) with no further qualification, neither the title nor author of the cited dictionary:

*tanūr aśokasya padā ghnatībhiḥ puraṇdhribhiḥ puṣpaśarāstraśālā |
śliṣyannavālaktakapaṇkaṭaṅkāt sindūramudrāsaciveva cakre || ŚKC 6.30 ||*

With the women stamping their feet [on it],
the trunk of the *aśoka* tree, which is the arsenal of the flower-arrowed Kāma,
was [like] provided with a vermilion seal
because of the fresh shiny red ointment transferred [there] [from the women's feet].

J. comm. [...] 'striyāṃ mūrtis tanus tanūḥ' iti koṣaḥ [...]

Amarakośa 2.336.1: *kāyo dehaḥ klībapuṃsoḥ striyāṃ mūrtis tanus tanūḥ*

¹⁷ Sharma 2001: 475.

¹⁸ I will use this formula throughout to introduce my paraphrase of Jonarāja's comments.

¹⁹ See, for instance, the usage of this phrase by Mallinātha (Tubb and Boose 2007: 29–30).

In Maṅkha's verse: Jonarāja explains *tanūs* (fem. nom. sing.) as a synonym of *tanu°* (fem. nom. sing.), meaning "body", as specified in the *Amarakośa*.

The same lack of source citation can be observed also when Jonarāja quotes exemplary verses from other canonical court poems to explain similar images or expressions used by Maṅkha.

In his commentary on the four cantos under study, the only quotation comes from Kālidāsa's *Kumārasaṃbhava*. As we can see, neither the title of the *mahākāvya* nor the name 'Kālidāsa' is mentioned in Jonarāja's commentary:

malīmasāśrīr madhupānasakto bheje latāḥ puṣpavatīḥ sphuṭaṃ yaḥ |
sa eva caitreṇa bata dvirephaḥ puṣpeṣu rāje vihitāḥ purodhāḥ || ŚKC 6.38 ||
 With [his] extremely dark luster, [and] drunk off the flowers' nectar,
 he certainly enjoyed [the company] of the blooming creepers.
 Oh! Such a bee did Caitra appoint to the rank of chief priest in Kāma's kingdom?!

J. comm. *malīmasātīkṣṇā śrīr yasya | taruṇa ityārthaḥ | vṛddhatve hi svasvavaṇāpacayo bhavati | dṛśyate hi vyabhicārābhāve 'pi viśeṣaṇopanyāsaḥ pāramparyeṇārthāntaradyotanārthaḥ | yathā 'ākāśam asiśyāmam' ity asiśyāmatvena dūrākāśotplavanapratītiḥ | dūrākāśasyaiva śyāmatvadarśanāt | [...]*

Transl. "Whose splendor is extremely dark," which means that the referent is young. Indeed, in old age, the proper colors of things fade. One can observe that even in the case of *vyabhicārābhāvas* the employment of an adjective (*viśeṣaṇa*, i.e., "dark") [has] the scope of manifesting another meaning in an indirect manner. For instance, in the phrase "**the sky, dark as a sword**", one understands flying upward toward a sky which is far away by the fact that [the sky] is dark as a sword. Because [only] of a sky which is far away one can see the darkness.

Jonarāja's source: Kālidāsa's *Kumārasaṃbhava*
te cākāśam asiśyāmam utpatya paramarṣayaḥ |
āsedur oṣadhiprasthaṃ manasā samaramhasaḥ || 6.36 ||
 "The great sages, too, having jumped into the sky, dark as a sword
 and equaling the mind in velocity, reached Oṣadhiprastha."²⁰

The lack of explicit citations in the latter two cases, namely quotations from dictionaries and literary sources, could be due to the fact that the cited works were certainly popular in Jonarāja's time and did not need further identification. Amara and Kālidāsa were—and still are, to date—the greatest and most frequent authorities in commentaries discussing vocabulary and poetry. It is curious, however, that Jonarāja never cites Maṅkha's own thesaurus, the *Anekārthakośa* or *Maṅkhakośa*,²¹ but chooses to rely on the *Amarakośa* alone.

²⁰ Transl. Kale 1917: 42.

²¹ Zachariae 1972: 1–7.

3 Jonarāja as philologist

Like other commentators, Jonarāja is attentive to possible variant readings in the *mūla* text, acting as a philologist when his witnesses present a reading that is dubious, wrong, or can be improved on.²² In the selected parts of the commentary, the only formulas used by Jonarāja are “or [this] could be one reading” (*iti vā pāṭhaḥ*) or “[this] is a bad reading” (*ity apapāṭhaḥ*) (see Appendix C).

One notable example of Jonarāja’s erudition is the following:

*kāluṣyaprāgabhāvapraṇayini nibiḍaprāvṛḍātaṅkanaśyad-
hamśaśreṇīśaraṇye prakāṭataṭaḷuṭhadvicilekhajāṭāle |
yo mukhye mānasākhye parisarasarasi prāptasamkrāntir [...] antar
bhūloka [...] lokanecchojjigamiṣaduragādhiśabhaṅgiṃ bibharti || ŚKC 4.52 ||*

Mirrored in that excellent lake which lies nearby, the famous Mānasa
—which displays a non-existent dirtiness; which is shelter for a gaggle of wild geese
that are fleeing for fear of the uninterrupted rainy season; which wears [the] matted hair
[made] from the crests of its waves openly **rolling** on the shores—
he, [the mountain], takes on the sinuous beauty of the king of snakes,
wishing to rise in his longing to contemplate the terrestrial world.

J. comm. [...] ‘*raṭat*’ *iti vā pāṭhaḥ* [...]

Jonarāja records the present participle °*raṭat*° (“shouting, roaring”) as a variant reading (*pāṭha*) for °*luṭhat*° (“rolling, flowing”), meaning “roaring waves” (°*raṭatvīci*°) rather than “rolling waves” (°*luṭhadvīci*°).

Interestingly, all the witnesses considered for this section—both those that contain the *mūla* text alone and those that contain both *mūla* text and commentary—have Jonarāja’s suggested variant (°*luṭhad*°) Eds.; °*raṭad*° B₂ J₁ J₂ L₁ O P₁ P₂ P₃ P₄ Ś₁ Ś₅ Ś₆). It is likely that these manuscripts were copied after Jonarāja’s time and corrected by the copyists with reference to his commentary. It is also possible that the editors of the printed editions, reading the commentary, decided to restore the first reading (°*luṭhat*°) to reflect the verses that Jonarāja was really commenting upon. In terms of *śabdālaṃkāras*, however, the variant °*raṭat*° indeed better serves the alliteration (*anuprāsa*) in the compound *prakāṭataṭaraṭad*°.

On another occasion, Jonarāja seems to remark on bad readings that are present only in some manuscripts:

*rasāyur utsaṅganilīnājānir anaṅgabhogāvalipāṭhabandī |
kiṃjalkatalle ‘jani sāhakāre nimajjanonmajjanakelikārah || ŚKC 6.55 ||*

With his wife tightly embraced, serving as the bard
reciting the continuous description of Anaṅga pleasures,
the nectar-eating bee played the game of diving and resurfacing
from the mango blossoms to **the pond** of *kiṃjalka* flowers.

²² See the example of Mallinātha in Tubb and Boose 2007: 16–17.

J. comm. [...] ‘*talpe*’ ity *apapāṭhaḥ* [...]

According to the commentator, °*talpe* (“on the bed/couch”) is a bad reading, with °*talle* (“in the reservoir/tank”, i.e., that of the bud of a flower) as the preferred lectio. In this case, the witnesses are not unanimous and present both forms (°*talle*] Eds. B₁ P₁ P₃ P₄; °*talle* corr. ex °*talpe* B₂; °*talpe* J₁ J₂ L₁ P₂ Ś₅; °*talpe* corr. ex °*talle* Ś₁ Ś₆), suggesting that the manuscripts used by Jonarāja might also have had °*talpe* as one of the possible readings.

As one might notice from the frequency of Jonarāja’s proposed variants, seven in four cantos (see Appendix C), the commentator does not refrain from adding his personal philological observations. This is interesting in the case of Jonarāja, who expands on the simple literal meaning—the objective declared at the beginning of his commentary—to offer a more thorough analysis of the *mūla* text while revealing his poetic sensibility.

4 Jonarāja between the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and the *Kirātārjunīya*

As mentioned in the introduction, Jonarāja commented on two other court poems, namely Bhāravi’s *Kirātārjunīya* (KA) and Janaka’s *Pṛthvīrājaviṇaya*. Although the latter is significant due to its historical context, namely the defeat of Muḥammad Ghūr by Pṛthvīrāj Chauhān in 1192,²³ I will consider only Jonarāja’s commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya* here, judging this more fertile ground for comparison with his commentary on the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Both Bhāravi and Maṅkha designed their court poems similarly in terms of literary imagery: both poems are centered around the exploits of the god Śiva—who is the main deity in both cases, whether as the hero of the plot or disguised as a Kirāta²⁴—and both follow the traditional requirements for court poems. One might therefore expect analogous descriptions and strategies, so it is interesting to observe how differently (or similarly) Jonarāja glosses similar passages. For this comparison, I have selected two case studies based on themes that are frequent in both the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and the *Kirātārjunīya*: the concept of white splendor as associated with royalty, and the concept of *śrī-lakṣmī* in its ambiguous meaning of ‘royal power, majesty’ and ‘fickle divine wife’.

²³ Obrock 2015: 80.

²⁴ Obrock 2015: 76.

5 Case study 1: splendor as royalty

The strategy of employing poetic images related to light and luminosity to elevate depictions of royal figures derives from that established tradition according to which “famous kings are described as exceeding all beings in strength, outshining all in luster (*tejas*), transcending all in majesty”.²⁵

Mañkha and Bhāravi likewise feature descriptions of kings, both human and divine, who are surrounded by and emanate splendor. This is particularly visible in the cantos the authors dedicate to describing mountains: Himālaya in the fifth canto of the *Kirātārjunīya* and Kailāsa in the fourth canto of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* are anthropomorphized and depicted as kings encircled by luster.²⁶

The fourth canto of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, the *kailāsavarṇana*, is particularly remarkable as it takes the concept of royal splendor to an extreme. Regular allusion to luminosity, whiteness, and reflection shapes the fourth canto, and almost every verse contains one or more synonyms or quasi-synonyms belonging to the semantic sphere of light.²⁷ However, the whiteness of the mountain and its surroundings is also conveyed through other signifiers. Kailāsa is as white as a smile (*hāsa* in ŚKC 4.1, 64), as the waves of the milk ocean (ŚKC 4.4), as a royal goose (*haṃsa* in ŚKC 4.23), as the moon (*śaśin* in ŚKC 4.2), as camphor (*karpūra*, in ŚKC 4.5), and the like in a plethora of images that are a clear link to the mountain’s pure and righteous royal power. The most significant example is the following:

dikṣu dyutibhir eṇāṅkagabhastiprativastubhiḥ |
yaśāṃsi varṣatā yena rājanvanto mahībhrtaḥ || ŚKC 4.13 ||

The mountains are ruled by him, [Kailāsa], a just monarch,
who showers everywhere a rain of glory through [his] splendor,
which is equal to moonbeams.

²⁵ Gonda 1966: 5.

²⁶ The strategy of applying royal attributes to mountains is not unique to Mañkha, and can be found in works as early as the *Kumārasaṃbhava*, as Giuliano Boccali has observed (2011: 81). In fact, in the incipit of Kālidāsa’s court poem, Pārvaṭī’s father Himālaya is “king of the mountains”, with “supremacy over the other ranges”, and possessor of “prosperous wealth”; the brightness reflects his magnanimous royalty.

²⁷ Among the verbal roots, for instance, one finds √*bhā* (ŚKC 4.2, 30), √*śri* (ŚKC 4.3), √*cakās* (ŚKC 4.5, 61), and √*rāj* (ŚKC 4.10); among the nouns, *raśmi* (ŚKC 4.3, 10, 57), *śrī* (ŚKC 4.3, 30), *bha* (ŚKC 4.14), *aṃśu* (ŚKC 4.4, 11, 34), *dyuti* (ŚKC 4.6, 13, 53), *dīpti* (ŚKC 4.47), *gabhasti* (ŚKC 4.6, 13), *tejas* (ŚKC 4.12, 48), *yaśas* (ŚKC 4.13), *lakṣmī* (ŚKC 4.23), *prakāśa* (ŚKC 4.57), and *ruci* (ŚKC 4.63, 64). The lights, namely those of the moon and sun over the snowy and crystalline slopes (*sphāṭika* in ŚKC 4.2, 12, 31, 57), reflected by Kailāsa in turn, are expressed by the past participle *bimbīta* (ŚKC 4.32, 48) and the noun *pratibimba* (ŚKC 4.16, 25), and are often accompanied by adjectives indicating whiteness and purity, such as *sita* (ŚKC 4.6) and *śveta* (ŚKC 4.20).

A similar description of a mountain king is found in the fifth canto of the *Kirātārjunīya*, the *parvatavarṇana*. Not only does Bhāravi describe Himālaya as the powerful king of the mountains (*acalādhipa* in KA 5.17), completely immersed in bright golden scenery, but he also qualifies the king as a righteous regent:

guṇasampadā samadhigamya paraṃ mahimānam atra mahite jagatām |
nayaśālīni śriya ivādhipatau viramanti na jvalitum auśadhayaḥ || KA 5.24 ||

Having attained the highest excellence due to the abundance of their virtues, on this [mountain] worshiped by the worlds, the luminous herbs do not stop shining, just like fortune for a king endowed with political wisdom.²⁸

Both Mañkha and Bhāravi incorporate the idea of a flawless king, who is not only powerful and luminous in appearance, but also righteous and adherent to certain moral principles. In the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, this is illustrated by the fact that the mountain king Kailāsa shares his grace and fortune with his subjects; in the *Kirātārjunīya*, Himālaya practices right conduct and just policy.

How does Jonarāja interpret these verses? The main point of Jonarāja's glosses on the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* is that the splendor of the mountain is like the glory of a magnanimous king, which, therefore, must be shared:

J. comm. ad ŚKC 4.13: [...] *parvatā rājanvantaḥ praśasto rāja yeśāṃ te bhavanti | kailāsaḥ śailānāṃ surājety arthaḥ | rājño yaśovarṣaṇam ucitam.*

The mountain subjects are ruled by a king who showers them with glory (*yaśas*), abundant and auspicious as rain (*varṣa*), and, thus glorified, they shine in return. "It is appropriate" (*ucitam*), Jonarāja notes: being generous is the *conditio sine qua non* by which the king is legitimated as auspicious and good (*praśasta rāja*, *surāja*) by his subjects.

In commenting on the *Kirātārjunīya* verse, on the other hand, Jonarāja becomes more specific, enumerating the political and moral qualities a good king (*surājan*) must possess:

Jonarāja's comm. ad KĀ 5.24: *guṇānāṃ gurulaghvādīnāṃ sampattis tayā param utkṛṣṭaṃ mahimānaṃ prāpyauśadhyo jvalitum na viramanti na nivartante | ata eva jagataḥ pūjye 'smin vyādhiśamanaśaktauśadhilābhāt—yathā guṇānāṃ nayārjavādīnāṃ sampadā mātmyaṃ prāpya lakṣmyaḥ svāmini jvalitum na viramanti ||*²⁹

²⁸ Transl. by the author with reference to Roodbergen 1984: 287 and Peterson 2016: 85.

²⁹ The text is not completely clear as it is still unedited. See Bhatt 2013: 75.

In the natural world of the mountain, the magical and luminous herbs (*oṣadhi*) do not stop shining and are therefore praised by all beings for their healing properties (*vyādhiśamana*); in the good king's soul, the lights of happiness and success (*lakṣmyaḥ*) keep shining as he rules with qualities such as political wisdom (*naya*), rectitude (*ārjava*), and so forth. For Jonarāja, the two qualities of political wisdom and rectitude are certainly a prerequisite for a king's obtaining legitimate *māhātmya*, a dignity and majesty derived from magnanimity.

In comparing Mallinātha's *Ghāṇṭapatha*, the most complete and well-known commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya*, with Jonarāja's commentary, one might notice a shift in perspective.

Mallinātha's comm. ad KĀ 5.24: [...] *nayaśāliny adhipatau nītiṣaṃpanne rājñi* [...] *anyatra saṃdhyādiguṇasampadā* | [...]

For Mallinātha, the king's "ability to spread luster"³⁰ (*mahimānam* in KĀ 5.24b) is not related to his magnanimity or rectitude, as Jonarāja maintains, but rather to the glory a kingdom acquires by reflecting the king's victories and good strategy in battle. By "*saṃdhi* and so on", in fact, Mallinātha intends the six means of statecraft outlined in the *Manusmṛti*—alliance, war, marching, halting, dividing the army, and seeking protection³¹—thus inserting the verse into a more military context.

Although Jonarāja, in the previous two cases, prefers to dwell longer on the civic and ethical aspects of royalty, he is certainly not ignorant of the concept of royal splendor as acquired through victories in war.³² In another verse from the fifth canto of the *Kirātārjunīya*, for instance, he shows that the splendor of a king is not limited to his inward morality, but also includes outward physical conquest. When commenting on Bhāravi's final words to Arjuna on Indrakīla mountain (KĀ 5.52), for example, Jonarāja explains that the splendid glory (*śrī*) of a king, in this case Arjuna, also consists in the conquest of territories through war.³³

³⁰ Roodbergen 1984: 288.

³¹ MS 7.160; see Olivelle 2013: 277.

³² Compounds like *svalakṣmī* and *rājyalakṣmī* as peculiar to the king also appear in Jonarāja's *Dvīṭyā Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, together with *jayalakṣmibhiḥ* (DRT 364) in the plural form, as in KĀ 5.24, translatable as the "fortunes of war" (Slaje 2014: 115). See also J. comm. ad Maṅkha's ŚKC 6.4, where the "six royal policies" (*ṣaḍguṇya*), the core principles of governance a king must master to become successful, are mentioned with reference to King Vasanta, the personification of springtime.

³³ See J. comm. ad KĀ 5.52: [...] *bhūmilābhādibahuśrī* [...].

6 Case study 2: *śrī* as prosperity

The concept of *śrī*, or *lakṣmī*, the splendid glory that always accompanies a successful king, is connected to that of splendor as a sign of royalty and is significant in both the *Kirātārjunīya* and the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*.³⁴

In the poetic imagination, however, many are the occasions when the meaning of *śrī-lakṣmī* as the impersonal concept of a kingdom's prosperity, fertility, and wealth³⁵ overlaps with the mythological image of Śrī-Lakṣmī as “the queen of kings [...] a sign of a virtuous reign”.³⁶ The poetic personification of Śrī-Lakṣmī represents “the embodiment of auspicious, particularly royal, qualities”³⁷ in the form of a goddess accompanying a high-ranked male figure. As Kinsley notes on the earlier couple, that of Śrī and Soma, the presence of the goddess at Soma's side after his acquisition of royal power is particularly interesting, as here “she demonstrates one of her main characteristics, that of bestowing royal authority or being present where royal authority exists”.³⁸

In the sixth canto of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, which contains a description of spring, a female figure named Śrī-Lakṣmī appears in the following four instances:

kaśmīrakāntānanakimkarāṇi paṅkeruhāṇi kva na palvaleṣu |
athāvir āsan sahasopagantum vasantalakṣmyā iva viṣṭaratvam || ŚKC 6.3 ||

Where else, then, if not in the ponds, did their eyes discern the lotuses,
servants of the faces of the beautiful Kashmiri women,
as if they were becoming, all at once, the seat of Vasanta's Lakṣmī?

Jonarāja's comm. ad ŚKC 6.3: [...] *atha utprekṣyate—vasantalakṣmyā āsanatvam gantum iva | lakṣmyā padmāsanatvāt | padmeṣv eva vasantalakṣmīr avasad ity arthaḥ*.
Transl. Thus it is imagined [that the eyes of the Kashmiri women] become, as it were, the seat of Vasanta's Lakṣmī, because Lakṣmī's seat is the lotus. The meaning is this: Vasanta's Lakṣmī was really sitting on the lotuses.

³⁴ The concept of *śrī* is particularly relevant for Bhāravi, as he opens his *Kirātārjunīya* “with the word *śrī* (good fortune), and [...] uses *lakṣmī* (indicating auspiciousness) as a sort of signature in the final stanzas of all *sargas*” (Peterson 2003: 64–65).

³⁵ Gonda 1966: 46; Kinsley 1988: 19.

³⁶ Bailly 2000: 138. For instances of *madhuśrī* as the goddess of Spring in other court poems, see Renou's “déesse” in his translation of *Raghuvamśa* 9.45 (Renou 1928). *Madhuśrī* (or *Vasantalakṣmī*) appears as the personification of the “Beauty of Spring” also in *Kumārasambhava* 3.30 (*madhuśrī*), *Kirātārjunīya* 10.31 (*vasantalakṣmī*), and *Śiśupālavadha* 6.69 (*madhuśrī*). For a discussion on the capitalization of the word *śrī*, see Hildebeitel 1990: 149.

³⁷ Kinsley 1988: 20.

³⁸ Kinsley 1988: 23.

puṣpāvṛtāṅgo nibiḍālinādaḥ kelīvaneṣūnnatacampako 'bhūt |
caitraśriyo nūpuraniḥsvanāṅko nṛttodyatāyā iva daṇḍapādaḥ || ŚKC 6.27 ||

With its limbs fully covered in flowers
 and the buzzing of a compact swarm of bees,
 the *campaka* tree, protruding from the pleasant forests,
 looked like the lifted leg of Caitra's Śrī,
 engaged in dance with her ankle ornament ringing out.

Jonarāja's comm. ad ŚKC 6.27: [...] *viśvavijayarūpakāryasiddhidarśanān nṛttapravṛttāyāś caitralakṣmyāḥ samāñjīraśiñjato daṇḍapāda ivonnatacampakavṛkṣaḥ kṛḍāvaneṣv abhūt |* [...] | *viśvaṃ jītvā nṛtyatyāś caitralakṣmyā daṇḍapādatvena campakaḥ saṃbhāvyate.*

Transl. The lofty magnolia in the pleasure gardens became like the lifted leg, ringing out with the anklet of Caitralakṣmī, the goddess of spring, who was dancing at the sight of the accomplishment of her victory over the world. [...] The magnolia is imagined as becoming the extended leg of Caitra's Lakṣmī, who was dancing after having conquered the whole world.

sukho 'nilaḥ khaṃ viśadaṃ jalāni ramyāṇi tejas taruṇaṃ navā bhūḥ |
aho madhoḥ kācana śauryalakṣmīś cakāra bhūteṣv api yā vikāram || ŚKC 6.37 ||

Gentle the wind, limpid the sky, pleasant the waters,
 mild the heat, fresh the earth—oh!
 Truly this extraordinary heroic Lakṣmī of Madhu
 was the one who provoked such transformation in all living entities!

Jonarāja's comm. ad ŚKC 6.37: [...] *yā śauryalakṣmīr bhūteṣu pṛthivyādiṣv api vikriyāṃ cakre, sā vasantasya vikramasamṛddhiḥ kācana lokottarāsīt |* [...]

Transl. This one, the heroic Lakṣmī, who transformed even beings, the earth, and so forth, was the extraordinary heroic triumph of Spring.

madhuśriyaḥ kuṅkumapattrabhaṅgān adhyāvasat kiṃśukakuḍmalāni |
alis tadīyais ca ghanai rajobhiḥ prāṇāgnihoṭrakramam anvatiṣṭhat || ŚKC 6.52 ||

A bee was inhabiting the buds of the *kiṃśuka* tree,
 which are the saffron ink designs of Madhu's Śrī,
 and thanks to [their] dense pollen,
 it performed an entire sequence of the *prāṇāgnihoṭra*.

Jonarāja's comm. ad ŚKC 6.52: [...] *vasantalakṣmyāḥ kuṅkumapattrabhaṅgāṃs tadrūpāṇi kiṃśukakuḍmalāni bhramaro 'dhyāvasad adhyatiṣṭhat |* [...] | *madhuśrīr nāyikā sthānīyā.*

Transl. The black bee sat in the buds of the parrot tree, which have the shape of saffron ink designs [on the body of] Vasantalakṣmī. [...] Madhuśrī is presented as a female character [i.e., the female protagonist in a drama].

Another king in poetry, the personification of Spring (Vasanta, also called Madhu and Caitra by Maṅkha), is depicted alongside an everpresent Śrī or Lakṣmī. It is without a doubt that Maṅkha intends Śrī-Lakṣmī not only as an impersonal

concept, but also as the divine consort of Spring, possibly following the model of other divine couples such as Soma and Śrī, Dharma and Śrī, Indra and Śrī, Kubera and Śrī, and, above all, Viṣṇu and Śrī.³⁹

In Jonarāja's commentary, the words *lakṣmī* and *śrī* are interchangeable and can be considered synonyms. In commenting on *caitraśrī* in ŚKC 6.27, for instance, Jonarāja chooses the compound *caitralakṣmī*; for *madhuśrī* in ŚKC 6.52, he employs *vasantalakṣmī*.

The naturalistic and more immediate meaning of these verses—i.e., nature awakening and thriving at springtime, the days getting longer, and the like—is not predominant in the commentary. What emerges from Jonarāja's glosses is the image of a kingdom's welfare and success (*śrī* as an impersonal concept) obtained through a real female character, the personification of royal success (*Śrī* as Spring's companion).

The physical manifestation of Śrī-Lakṣmī is explained by Jonarāja at various points. In ŚKC 6.3, Lakṣmī is *really* (*eva* in J. comm.) the goddess, depicted with one of her iconographic attributes, the lotus seat. In ŚKC 6.27, Śrī appears in the image of a dancing woman (*nṛtyatyāś caitralakṣmyā* in J. comm.) with her leg extended upward, while in ŚKC 6.27, Śrī is a woman (*nāyikā* in J. comm.) smeared with golden saffron drawings. For Jonarāja, then, the appearance of a corporeal Śrī does not exclude the abstract nature of *śrī* as fortune, auspiciousness, conquest, and victory. Śrī-Lakṣmī brings heroism (*śauryalakṣmī* in J. comm. ad ŚKC 6.37) and victory over the world (*viśvaṃ jitvā* in J. comm. ad ŚKC 6.27) without leaving her companion, Spring.

Śrī, however, is tied to a king only insofar as he reigns successfully; her loyalty is, at the same time, both the cause and the consequence of the king's actions. In the *Kirātārjunīya*, for instance, Bhāravi compares Śrī's attachment to a king to that of a wife to a virtuous husband:

guṇānuraktām anuraktasādhanaḥ kulābhimānī kulajām narādhipaḥ |
parais tvadanyaḥ ka ivāpahārayen manoramām ātmavadhūm iva śriyam || KA 1.31 ||

What other king [if not you], proud of his birth and assured of loyal friends,
would let the enemies steal the fortune (*śriyam*) of his royal house,
which is attached to him because of his qualities,
like his own lovely highborn wife in love with her husband's virtues?
(Transl. with reference to Peterson 2016, 13)

³⁹ See Kinsley 1988: 23–26. Although some scholars have interpreted *-śrī* and *-lakṣmī* as two suffixes added to a male noun to mark its female gender (Feller 1995, 94–95), in Maṅkha's case, reducing *-śrī* to a mere "feminizing device" (Feller 1995: 94) would weaken the poetic image.

Jonarāja comments the following:

J. comm. ad KA 1.31. [...] | *na ca svata eveyaṃ gatety āha guṇeṣv anuraktāṃ sarāgāṃ kulajāṃ kulāgatām | na ca tvayi viraktāḥ prajā ity āha anuraktaṃ sādhanāṃ prakṛtimaṇḍalaṃ yasya saḥ | na ca bhavān virakta ity āha kulābhimānī evaṃvidhāṃ lakṣmīm ātmahastena tvam apahārayeḥ | ata evātmavadhūm iva yadvā ātmavadhūm ivety upamānadvāreṇa śrīyaś capalāropaṃ khaṇḍayati tvam ivety upamā | tvam eva pramādād vadhūśrīyau hāritavān ityarthah* [...] ⁴⁰

Transl. [The poet] does not say “she left [you] of her own accord”, as she is honorable and in love with [your] qualities; he does not say “the subjects do not love you”, as [your] friends are loyal; he does not say “you are disaffected”, because you are proud of belonging to a noble family; you yourself impel [others] to take your Lakṣmī. Therefore, by means of the object of comparison (*upamāna*) “like his own wife”, or else, “like his own wife”, ⁴¹ [the poet] eliminates the idea that Śrī is fickle. This is the simile (*upamā*): “[fickle] like you”. The meaning is: it is you, in fact, that, out of madness, let others steal both your wife and your wealth.

Jonarāja here reverses the image of a fickle (*capalā*, *cañcalā* or *lolā*) fortune (*śrī*), traditionally referred to as “something that comes and goes”. ⁴² A king’s fortune is like a bride (*vadhū*), passionate (*sarāgā*) and coming from a noble family (*kulajā*), who would never leave her husband. Contrary to Mallinātha, who does not engage with a “deeper level of meaning” ⁴³ and cites only superficially sources on the qualities a good king must possess, ⁴⁴ Jonarāja dwells more on the psychological interpretation of the verse, although staying true to his principle of conciseness. Śrī cannot be blamed, and only the king’s madness (*pramāda*) is making him the sole culprit of his own disgrace, the loss of both wife and fortune.

7 Conclusions

Through the presentation of a few examples from Mañkha’s *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and, to a lesser extent, Bhāravi’s *Kirātārjunīya*, the present article serves as a preliminary study setting the grounds for a more in-depth analysis of Jonarāja’s commentaries on court poems.

A first tendency we observe in Jonarāja’s style as a commentator is that he quotes external sources less extensively than do his peers. Contrary to other

⁴⁰ See Bhatt 2013: 16. The text requires a new critical edition.

⁴¹ The text of Jonarāja’s commentary is probably corrupt, as the alternative interpretation introduced with the particle *yadvā* (“or else”) is the same as the primary one, i.e., *ātmavadhūm iva*. Possibly a mistake of the scribe.

⁴² Bailly 2000: 138.

⁴³ McCrea 2010: 245 and McCrea 2010: 245, fn. 26.

⁴⁴ See Roodbergen 1984: 55–56.

commentators, such as Mallinātha, he tends to use passages from illustrious authors only insofar as they are functional to the commentary itself, and cites them only when truly necessary. Jonarāja never flaunts his knowledge, and the authors he picks for his commentary—the works of Pāṇini, Amara, and Kālidāsa being the most cited—belong to a well-established canon, frequently used by commentators and accessible to a somewhat learned audience. Jonarāja, however, seems interested in specifying neither the *loci* of his quotations nor the names of the authors he quotes, as is perhaps superfluous for his readers.

In addition, he never tries to fit Mañkha's verses into specific aesthetic patterns, he does not refer to concepts such as *rasa* or *dhvani*, and does not list plethoras of examples from other *kāvya*s to prove the correctness or wrongness of the verses he is commenting upon. The only time he quotes Kālidāsa (see above p. 6) is simply to clarify the image of a compound and make it comprehensible through an illustrious, well-known precedent. It is evident that Jonarāja is not eager to categorize or compare the verses of different poets, and he does not attempt any qualitative judgment of the verses he is commenting upon. He simply acknowledges the *mūla* text and makes it intelligible.

Even when commenting on figures of speech (*alaṃkāras*)—a topic that I have left out of the present study but intend to pursue in future work on the subject—Jonarāja aims for simplicity. In his commentary on the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, he broadly makes note of *alaṃkāras* (the most common being *upamā*, *utprekṣā*, and *śleṣa*) at the end of most commented sections, but does not expand on them. In this sense, he stays true to the principles he declared in his *maṅgalas*: *paryāya* and *vācyaṛtha*, namely the use of synonyms for difficult words and the expression of literal meanings. In Jonarāja's case, simplicity goes together with conciseness. He is rarely prolix and, most of the time, his remarks are minimal and spot-on.

The second tendency we note is that Jonarāja is philologically aware, as he often proposes variants and points out errors. When the meaning of the verse seems obscure or the text corrupt, he inserts expressions like “this is a wrong reading” (*ity apapāṭhaḥ*) or “this is an alternative reading” (*iti vā pāṭhaḥ*). As mentioned above, the frequency of Jonarāja's philological observations (see Appendix C) is telling, as it reveals his own poetic sensibility in his choosing variants that are not only meaningful, but also fit aesthetically or even increase the musicality of a verse.

Jonarāja's tastes emerge also from his interpretation of specific images and metaphors. In the two case studies analyzed above, one may observe that Jonarāja dwells longer on concepts such as good government and fortune. Further research is needed to understand whether commenting on the figure of a magnanimous king and his prosperous kingdom could have been an opportunity to allude to the new reigning elite. This is not unreasonable if one frames Jonarāja's commentaries

within a broader agenda that included his *Dvitiyā Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, considered in all respects a “guideline for balanced sovereignty”.⁴⁵ This, however, remains an open question.

Appendix A

From the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

ŚKC 4.26–27

mānasāskandanapaṭuḥ spṛśann utkaṭakāntatām |
dadhānaḥ sukhadaṃ rūpaṃ siddhasādhyaḡaṇāśritaḥ ||
sālakāntasthitir nīlakaṇṭhādhyāsanapāvanaḥ |
*ya ivābhāti yaccitram **ahar** yakṣais tu sevyate ||*

Vigorously ascending lake Mānasa, or over the Mind,
 with the summits of his ridges extending upwards, or with his immense beauty shaken,
 with his pleasant valleys, or with his gorgeous appearance,
 frequented by Siddhas, Sādhya, and Gaṇas, or surrounded by groups of Siddhasādhya,
 standing beautifully for [i.e., as the backdrop of] the Sāla trees, or staying within the borders of
Alakā,
 being the pure abode of peacocks, or becoming Śiva’s pure seat,
 he shines, as if he were wonderfully venerated
 not only by the lions, [but] continuously by the Yakṣas.

J. comm. [...] *ahar* iti ‘*kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoge dvitīyā*’ [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.5: *kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoge*

“A *dvitīyā* occurs after stems denoting *kāla* ‘(measure of) time’ or *adhvan* ‘(measure of) path, road’ when *atyantasaṃyoga* ‘continuous connection’ is signified”.⁴⁶

In Mañkha’s verse: the stem *ahar* should be read as the neuter accusative (*dvitīyā*) singular *ahan*, in the sense of “continuously”.

ŚKC 6.23

dvijādhirājena gavāṃ prasādāt pratikṣapaṃ kārītabhūmisekaḥ |
pānthapriyāṇaṃ ṛtacakravartī netreṣv avagrāham apācakāra ||

Night after night, Spring, the emperor of seasons,

⁴⁵ Slaje 2014: 27.

⁴⁶ Sharma 2002: 111.

removed the obstacle [to the tears] in the eyes of the travelers' lovers,
with the earth made exceptional by the Moon through the brightness of its rays;
[at the same time] he removed the obstacle [to the lack of rains]

by sprinkling [his] reign with the prasāda of cow milk
distributed by the chief of the Brahmins.

J. comm. (1) [...] 'hṛkror anyatarasyām' iti pākṣikaṃ kartṛtvam [...]

Pāṇini, Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.4.53: hṛkror anyatarasyām. N

"A *kāraka* which serves as the agent of *hṛN* 'to carry' or *DUkṛN* 'to do, make' not used with *ṆiC*, optionally is termed *karman* when used with *ṆiC*".⁴⁷

In Maṅkha's verse: Jonarāja stresses the anomaly (yet still a possibility, as Pāṇini's *sūtra* confirms) of *kārita*^o (causative past participle of the verb $\sqrt{kṛ}$, "caused someone to do something"), whose agent is, in this case, not the usual accusative, but the instrumental *dvijādhirājena*.

J. comm. (2) [...] 'ave graho'⁴⁸ varṣapratibandhe' iti vā ghañ [...]

Pāṇini, Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.51: ave grahaḥ varṣapratibandhe

"Affix *GHaN* optionally occurs after verbal root *grahA* to denote *bhāva*, and a *kāraka* other than *kartṛ*, when the root cooccurs with a nominal *pada* which contains *ava* and the derivate denotes *varṣapratibandha* 'lack of rain in season'".⁴⁹

In Maṅkha's verse: the affix *a* is added to the verbal root *ava*+ \sqrt{grah} in the word *avagrāham*, meaning the obstacle that consists of lack of rain.

ŚKC 6.40

saṃkocitāvyaya eva yaḥ prāganehasā puṣpamitaṃpacena |
tadā sa kiṃjalkamahāsubhikṣe līlāḥ śīśikṣe kati na dvirephaḥ ||

The black bee, who was deprived of giving and receiving because of the previous season,
[winter,] which is poor of flowers,
how many games would not learn now,
during the [time of] the *kiṃjalka* tree's great opulence?

J. comm. [...] 'mitanakhe ca' iti khaś [...]

Pāṇini, Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.2.34: mitanakhe ca

"Affix *KHaś* also occurs after verbal root *DUpacAṣ* when the root cooccurs with a nominal *pada* which contains *mita* 'measured, limited' and *nakha* 'nails' as *karman*".⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Sharma 2000: 267.

⁴⁸ *ave graho* (em.)] *avagraho* Eds., printing typo probably influenced by *avagrāham* in the *mūla* text.

⁴⁹ Sharma 2002: 504.

⁵⁰ Sharma 2002: 372.

In Mañkha's verse: Jonarāja comments on the word *mitaṃpaca*^o as composed of *mita* + \sqrt{pac} + affix *a*, meaning “miser, limited”, with the augment *m* added to the preceding word (*mita* + *m*).

ŚKC 6.41

dikṣu kṣatasvāparasair aśokaiḥ kṛtapratāpānalasūtrapātāḥ |
gāḍhābhīmānagrahilo jaganti tṛṇāya mene na jhaṣāvacūlaḥ ||

Having measured the fire of his ardor against that of the *aśoka*,
whose [once] inert nectar was scattered in all directions,
the fish-bannered Kāma, absorbed into his deep pride,
did not consider the worlds as something worthless. (6.41)

J. comm. [...] ‘*manyakarmaṇi*–’ *iti caturthī* [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.17: *manyakarmaṇy anādare vibhāṣā’ prāṇiṣu*

“A *caturthī* optionally occurs to express the object of *manĀ* ‘to consider, treat’ provided that such an object is not expressed otherwise, that it does not denote *prāṇin* ‘living being’, and that disrespect is expressed”.⁵¹

In Mañkha's verse: Jonarāja comments on *tṛṇāya mene*, where *tṛṇāya* is the neuter dative (*caturthī*) singular of the word *tṛṇa*^o (“blade of grass”, a symbol of worthlessness), which follows the verb *mene* (third-person singular of the perfect *ātman*. of \sqrt{man}).

ŚKC 6.49

vikoṣakaṃdarpakṛpāṇadhāmnā vyañjan samalabdham ivāṅgamaṅgam |
jalpākatotsekam iyāya cūtasaurabhyasabhyo madhupāyilokaḥ ||

As if each one of their members was carrying the luster
of Kandarpa's unsheathed sword,
the group of nectar-drinking bees,
[royal guards] at the court of the mango-tree fragrance,
increased their customary yelling. (6.49)

J. comm. [...] ‘*jalpabhikṣakuṭṭa*–’ *iti śākan* [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.2.155: *jalpabhikṣakuṭṭalunṭavṛṇaḥ śākan*

“Affix *ŚākaN* occurs to denote *kartṛ* after verbal roots *jalpA* ‘to speak’, *bhikṣA* ‘to beg’, *kuṭṭA* ‘to cut, censure’, *luṇṭhA* ‘to steal’ and *vṛṇ* ‘to be shattered’ when the agent performs the action at the current time because of his nature, sense of duty, or skill”.⁵²

⁵¹ Sharma 2002: 125.

⁵² Sharma 2002: 449.

In Mañkha's verse: Jonaraja comments on the word *jalpāka*°, formed by *jalpa* and the affix *aka* in the sense of "a person who has a habit of chatting, loquacious".

ŚKC 6.55

rasāyur utsaṅganilīnājānir anaṅgabhogāvalipāṭhabandī |
kiṃjalkatalle 'jani sāhakāre nimajjanonmajjanakelikārah ||

See transl. above, p. 7

J. comm. [...] 'jāyāyā niṇ' iti niṇ [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.4.134: *jāyāyā niṇ*

"The form *niṇ* comes in place of the final of a *bahuvrīhi* compound which ends in *jāyā* 'wife'".⁵³

In Mañkha's verse: °*jāni* replaces °*jāyā* at the end of the *bahuvrīhi* compound *utsaṅganilīnājānir*.

ŚKC 6.63

prṣṭhabhramatsajavaṣaṭpadacacrahnam
yatprocchvasatkusumam āvirabhūl latānām |
mānasya pakṣmaladṛśām sahasaiva peṣṭum
tatspaṣṭamānmathagharatṭavilāsam āsīt ||

When the circle of the speedy bees appeared,
buzzing behind the blossomed buds of the creepers,
these, [the buds], became Love's grindstone,
as if to crush the pride of the long-lashed women. (6.63)

J. comm. [...] *peṣṭum* iti 'jāsiniprahaṇa-' iti karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.56: *jāsiniprahaṇanāṭakrāthapiṣām hiṃsāyām*

"A *ṣaṣṭhī* occurs after a nominal stem to express, as a remainder, the object of an action denoted by the verbal roots *jasU* 'to wish harm to, to torment' and *han* 'to smite', used with the preverbs *ni* and *pra*,

naṭ 'to injure' and *krāth* and *piṣ*, they mean 'to wish harm to'".⁵⁴

In Mañkha's verse: Jonarāja comments on the fact that the object of the infinite *peṣṭum* (from verb √*piṣ*) is the genitive *mānasya*.

⁵³ Sharma 1999: 746–47.

⁵⁴ Sharma 2002: 158.

ŚKC 6.65

*ye gātre yayur adhvagotpaladrśām aṅgāraṇṇaprathāṃ
ye saṃbhogarasālasālasavadhūnetrāñcalair añcitāḥ |
śrīkhaṇḍādriguḥāgrhāntarabhuvāḥ śṛṅgāriṣu pronmiṣac-
chāpānugrahaśaktayo vavṛdhire te **haṃyavo** vāyavaḥ ||*

They were famous for the charcoal rain on the lotus-eyed women of the travelers,
[and] honored by the sidelong glances of the young wives,
entirely [too] exhausted for the game of lovemaking:
these, the arrogant Winds, coming from inside
the house caves of the sandalwood mountain,
ascended over the men in love, with their luminous powers of [conferring] gifts or curses.
(6.65)

J. comm. [...] ‘*ahaṃśubhamor yus’ iti yus* [...]

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.2.140: *ahaṃśubhamoḥ yus*

“The *taddhita* affix *yuS* occurs to denote the sense of *matUP* after syntactically related nominal stems *aham* ‘ego’ and *śubham* ‘auspicious’ when they end in nominative”.⁵⁵

In Mañkha’s verse: Jonarāja explains the formation of the compound *ahaṃ-yu°* as “possessing himself” in the sense of “full of himself, arrogant, haughty”.

ŚKC 17.5

*bibhrāṇo vapur ahimāli luptatāpaṃ
pratyuptām akhilagaṇair **divādisārām** |
āścaryaṃ caritam udañcayann apūrvāṃ
śarvāṇīdayitatamaḥ sabhām avāpat ||*

Displaying his body adorned with snakes, *without any sign of frost*,
[and] without the pain [of rebirth], *without any heat*,
showing [his] astonishing deeds with all [his] troops at daybreak,
provided with all the roots, but with its quintessence in div,
Śarvāṇī’s most beloved entered that extraordinary assembly. (17.5)

J. comm. [...] ‘*diva ut’ iti divaśabdasyotvaprāpteḥ* [...]

Pāṇini *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6.1.130: *diva ut*

“The final sound segment of a *pada*, namely *div*, is replaced with *uT*.”⁵⁶

In Mañkha’s verse: Jonarāja is explaining the exceptional nature of Śiva, Śarvāṇī’s most beloved, by explaining that he is composed of all the roots, but his essence is *div*, the verbal root that indicates the brightness of the divine and etymologically forms the word “god” (*deva*) (J. comm. ad 17.5: [...] *gaṇair bhvādidbhir yuktām divādir eva dhātupāṭhacchedaviśeṣaḥ*

⁵⁵ Sharma 1999: 596.

⁵⁶ Sharma 2001: 131–32.

sāro yasyā ity apūrvatvam [...]). The commentator quotes a related passage from Patañjali's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (J. comm. ad 17.5: [...] 'diva ut' iti *divaśabdasyotvaprapṛteḥ* [...]) almost at the end of the passage. This quotation is not strictly necessary for interpreting Mañkha's verse, but it is used by Jonarāja to support his own interpretation versus that of others (J. comm. ad 17.5: [...] *kecit tu* [...]).

ŚKC 17.20

*dhiñ mūḍhā vitatham udāsanasvabhāvaṃ
bhāṣante puruṣa tava trilokabhartuḥ |
kartrī cet prakṛtir iyaṃ karotu kiñcit
kaivalyaṃ bhavadadhiroham antareṇa ||*

O Puruṣa, shame on the fools who wrongly state that your essence,
you who are the sustainer of the three worlds, is inactive.
If this Nature [really] is the agent, let's see if she can do anything in a liberated state
without leaning on you! (17.20)

J. comm. [...] *nandyāditvāl lyuḥ* [...]⁵⁷

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.1.134: *nandigrahipacāḍibhyo lyuṇinyacaḥ*
"Affixes *Lyu*, *ṆinI* and *aC* occur after verbal roots enumerated in the group headed by *nandI*
'to please', *grahI* 'to take, accept' and *pac* 'to cook' respectively".⁵⁸

In Mañkha's verse: Jonarāja is trying to explain the unusual word *udāsana*^o with the aforementioned Pāṇinian *sūtra* by listing the verbal root *ud* + $\sqrt{ās}$ among those headed by *nandI*. The affix *lyuḥ*, i.e., that of the *nomen actionis* -*ana*, is added to *udās* by Mañkha, who prefers it to the more common *udāsina*.

ŚKC 17.51

*saṃtaṣṭaṃ niśitatapoviśeṣamayyā vāsyā
vaḥ sakalam apīha gātratantram |
yuṣmabhyaṃ varam aham īpsitaṃ pradāsyē
bho vatsā khalu viracayya tadvratāni ||*

The whole warp of [your] limbs has been thinned out now
by the knife of your extremely sharp asceticism.
Sons, enough with [these] austerities!
I will grant you the boon you desire! (17.51)

J. comm. [...] '*alamkhalvoḥ*' iti *ktvāpratyayaḥ* [...]

⁵⁷ Jonarāja is paraphrasing Pāṇini, and the editors of the printed editions have possibly not marked this grammatical comment with inverted commas as in the other cases.

⁵⁸ Sharma 2002: 341.

Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.4.18: *alaṅkhalvoḥ pratiṣedhayoḥ prācāṃ ktvā*

“According to the Eastern grammarian, affix *Ktvā* occurs after verbal roots used in conjunction with *alam* and *khalu* when prohibition (*pratiṣeḥa*) is denoted.”⁵⁹

In Maṅkha’s verse: Jonarāja comments on the absolutive suffix *ya* (instead of *tvā* when the verb has a prefix) added to the verb *vi+√rac* and preceded by *khalu*, meaning “enough! stop!”.

Appendix B

From the *Amarakośa*

ŚKC 17.57

mattas taṃ varam iti dīptam āptavantas te yuktyā matim ativartituṃ yamasya |
tṛiṃ llokān atha ca pṛthak pṛthaṅ niroddhuṃ saṃnaddhā vyadhiṣata nūtnayatnasiddhim ||

After they received such a splendid boon from me,
these, [the three demons], even though they were ready to attack the three worlds one after another,
decided to accomplish a new deed to artfully elude Death’s design.

J. comm: [...] ‘navīno nūtno navaḥ | nūtnaś ca’ iti koṣaḥ [...]

Amarakośa 3.1.158–159: *pratyagro ‘bhinavo navyo navīno nūtno navaḥ* (3.1.158) *nūtnaś ca sukumāraṃ tu komalaṃ mṛdulaṃ mṛdu* (3.1.159)

In Maṅkha’s verse: Jonarāja explains the adjective *nūtna°* as a synonym of *navīna* “new, young, fresh”, as specified in the *Amarakośa*.

Appendix C

Jonarāja as a philologist

ŚKC 4.28

kvacit kavacitaḥ sāndranavāmbudakadambakaiḥ |
yo vimudrayati droṇīr añjanādrimadadruhaḥ ||

Armored here and there with flocks of dense, rainy clouds,
he is unsealing [his] caves, rivals of the pride of the [black] mountain Añjana.

⁵⁹ Sharma 2002: 601–2.

J. comm. [...] ‘*kavalitaḥ*’ ity *apapāṭhaḥ* [...]

Jonarāja notes that the variant *kavalitaḥ* (“devoured”) in place of *kavacitaḥ* (“armored”) is a corruption (*apapāṭha*), possibly coming from a witness of the *mūla* text we no longer possess. The available manuscripts do not contain the variant *kavalitaḥ*, although some of the witnesses present the nominative plural *kavacitāḥ* (*kavacitaḥ*) Eds. B₂ J₂ L₁ O P₂ P₄; *kavacitāḥ* J₁ P₁ P₃ Ś₁) as a variant.

ŚKC 6.14

śaśāka no yaḥ kimapi grahitum adhyāpyamāno ’pi varāṅganābhiḥ |
udyānalilānyabhṛtas tadānīm sa siddhasārasvatatām prapede ||

This cuckoo, [once] unable to learn anything,
not even [if] trained by the most excellent women,
now, [at springtime], playing in the royal gardens,
achieves the most perfect eloquence.

J. comm. [...] ‘*purāṅganābhiḥ*’ iti vā *pāṭhaḥ* | [...]

Jonarāja conjectures *purāṅganābhiḥ* (“by the women of the city”) as a variant of *varāṅganābhiḥ* (“by the most excellent women”; see J. comm. *varā uttamā*). The commentator’s variant fits the meaning of the verse in the sense that only the educated women from the city and court, not the rustic ones from the villages (see J. comm. [...] *nagarastrībhiḥ* | *na tu grāmyābhir ityarthāḥ* [...]), can possibly teach the cuckoos how to sing.

Most manuscripts present a third variant, namely *purāvadhūbhiḥ*, possibly a wrong reading for *puravadhūbhiḥ* (“by the female courtesans”), more in line with Jonarāja’s interpretation (*varāṅganābhiḥ*) Eds. J₂ P₄; *purāvadhūbhiḥ* B₁ B₂ J₁ L₁ P₁ P₂ Ś₁ Ś₅; *purāṅganābhiḥ* corr. ex *purāvadhūbhiḥ* P₃). In these manuscripts, however, the originally short *ā* of *puravadhūbhiḥ* must have been lengthened by the scribe due to metrical reasons, as the verse in question is an Upajāti and usually requires a long (*guru*) syllable on the eighth position of the second *pāda*.

ŚKC 6.64

pañktiḥ puṣpalihām aśeṣavanitāmānāvasānakriyā-
garvonnaddhavasantabaddhavitataśmaśruśriyaṃ bibhratī |
ālānāpasaratsmarebhavidhutāyaḥśṛṅghalollekhabhūr
visrabdham katham apy aho virahibhir na prekṣitum cakṣame ||

How could the men whose lovers are afar possibly observe, without fear—oh!—
this swarm of bees who have the luster of Spring’s thick beard, tied [into a dense bunch],
arrogant in the destruction of all women’s pride,
[and this] earth, marked by the metal chains
tossed about by that elephant of Smara, unleashed from [his binding] pole?

J. comm. [...] ‘*saṃdhā*’ iti vā *pāṭhaḥ* | *saṃdhā pratijñā* | [...]

Jonarāja records the variant reading °*saṃdhā*° in place of °*vitata*°, meaning in this context that the “wide/diffused beard of Spring” (°*vitataśmaśru* °) is also the “vow/promise/

announcement” (*saṃdhā* = *pratijñā*) of the coming season. The word *saṃdhā*, however, is unmetrical in that position, as the verse is a Śārdūlavikrīḍita.

ŚKC 17.4

*bhraśyadbhir damarendramauliratnair niryatnaprakaṭitanūtanopakārām |
velladbhir guhaśikhinaḥ śikhaṇḍakhaṇḍair ārabdhapratitatātālavṛntavṛttām ||*

With the fresh flower offerings effortlessly scattered [on the ground]
thanks to the gems fallen from the bowing head of the best of the immortals
[and] the waving of the palm-leaf fan commenced by the swirling tail-tufts of Guha’s peacock.

J. comm. [...] ‘*nṛttam*’ *iti vā pāṭhaḥ | nṛttaṃ spandanam* [...]

The proposed variant °*nṛttam* (“dance, movement in the sense of quivering”) is not possible in this verse. All the manuscripts present °*vṛttām* (“revolving”) as the only possible option, in accordance with the meter, Praharṣiṇī, which requires a long thirteenth syllable in each of the four *pādas*.

ŚKC 17.53

*ity asmadgiram adhiropya karṇavīthiṃ nedīyaḥ pramadarasokṣitekṣaṇās te |
mām evaṃ vinayamayākṣarāntaraṅgapronmīlatpadam agadan vinamrakaṇṭham ||*

[Having] pricked up their ears nearby at my speech [and] with their eyes moistened by tears of joy,
in this manner, with their heads bent, these, [the three demons], spoke to me
with words that showed their intentions through their humble syllables.

J. comm. [...] ‘*rasokṣaṇakṣaṇāḥ*’ *iti vā pāṭhaḥ* [...]

Along with the first interpretation of the verse (i.e., “with their eyes moistened by tears of joy”), Jonarāja’s variant *rasokṣaṇakṣaṇāḥ* is intended in the sense of “These, [the three demons], having occasion (°*kṣaṇāḥ*) for ablutions (°*ukṣaṇa*°) [performed] with the juices (°*rasa*°) of joy (*pramada*°), i.e., with sacred tears of joy”. This reading is possible, although none of the manuscripts present any significant variants ([*pramadarasokṣitekṣaṇās*] Eds. B₂ J₁ J₂ L₁ P₁ P₂ P₄ Ś₁ Ś₅; *pramadarasokṣitikṣaṇās* Ś₄; *pramadarasokṣitekṣiṇās* Ś₆).

References

Manuscripts

B₁ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Baroda, Oriental Institute Maharaja Sayajirao. Ms. no. II 4396. Paper, Devanāgarī script.

B₂ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Baroda, Oriental Institute Maharaja Sayajirao. Ms. no. II 8212. Paper, Devanāgarī script.

- J₁ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Jammu, Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, Formerly Raghunath Temple Library. Ms. no. 494 (1). Paper, Devanāgarī script.
- J₂ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and *ṭīkā*. Jammu, Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, Formerly Raghunath Temple Library. Ms. no. 753. Paper, Devanāgarī script.
- L₁ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. London, British Library, Formerly India Office Library. Ms. no. 2548. Paper, Devanāgarī script.
- O = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* and *ṭīkā*. Oxford, Bodleian Library. Ms. no. Oxf II 1234 (2). Birchbark, Śāradā script.
- P₁ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI). Ms. no. 197. Paper, Devanāgarī script.
- P₂ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI). Ms. no. 198. Paper, Śāradā script.
- P₃ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI). Ms. no. 199. Birchbark, Śāradā script.
- P₄ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI). Ms. no. 200. Paper, Devanāgarī script.
- Ś₁ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Śrīnagar, Oriental Research Library. Ms. no. 846.I. Paper, Śāradā script.
- Ś₄ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Śrīnagar, Oriental Research Library. Ms. no. 1194. Paper, Śāradā script.
- Ś₅ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Śrīnagar, Oriental Research Library. Ms. no. 1345. Birchbark, Śāradā script.
- Ś₆ = *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. Śrīnagar, Oriental Research Library. Ms. no. 1787. Paper, Śāradā script.

Primary sources

Amarakośa of Amarasiṃha.

- (a) Jhalakikar, V., and Bhandarkar, R. G. (eds.). *Amarakośa, with the commentary of Maheśvara*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot. 1907.
- (b) Available online at: http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskrit/6_sastra/2_lex/amarak1hu.htm.

Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.

- (a) Sharma, R. N. (transl.). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. II. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. 1990 [Reprint 2000]. (b) Sharma, R. N. (transl.). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. III. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. 1995 [Reprint 2002]. (c) Sharma, R. N. (transl.). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. IV. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. 1999. (d) Sharma, R. N. (transl.). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. V. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. 2001.

Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi.

- Bhatt, Dharmendrakumar (ed.). *Śrījonarājakṛtā Kirātārjunīyaṭīkā. Transcribed & Critically edited (3 Cantos)*. Delhi: National Mission for Manuscripts & Nag Publishers. 2013.
- Peterson, Indira V. (ed. and transl.). *Bhāravi. Arjuna and the Hunter*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press. 2016.

Kumārasaṃbhava of Kālidāsa.

- Kale, M. R. (ed.). *Kālidāsa's Kumārasaṃbhava, Canto 1–8*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1981.

Maṅkhakośa of Maṅkha.

- Zachariae, T. V. H. (ed.). *Der Maṅkhakośa*. Wien: Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1897.

Śrīkaṇṭhacarita of Maṅkha.

- Eds. = Durgaprasad, P., and Parab, K. P. (eds.). (a) KM 1887 = *The Śrīkaṇṭhacarita of Maṅkhaka, With the Commentary of Jonarāja. Kāvya-mālā*, Vol. 3. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press. 1887.

(b) KM 1900 = *The Śrīkaṇṭhacarita of Maṅkhaka, With the Commentary of Jonarāja. Kāvyaṃālā*, Vol. 3. Bombay: Tukārām Jāvajī. 1900 (second revised edition). (c) KM 1983 = *The Śrīkaṇṭhacarita of Maṅkhaka, With the Commentary of Jonarāja*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1983 (reprint).

Secondary sources

- Bailly, Constantina (2000): “Śrī-Lakṣmī: Majesty of the Hindu King”. In: *Goddesses who rule*. Edited by Benard, E. A. and Moon, B. A. New York: Oxford University Press, 133–148.
- Bhatt, Bhagavatprasad Narvarlal (1973): *Śrīkaṇṭhacaritam—A Study*. Baroda: University of Baroda Research Series.
- Boccali, Giuliano (2011): “La descrizione del Himālaya nel Kumārasaṃbhava (I, 1–17) di Kālidāsa”. *Indologica Taurinensia* 37: 75–106.
- Feller, Danielle (1995): *The Seasons in Mahākāvya Literature*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Gomez, Kashi (2016): *Beyond Sacred Landscapes. Poetic Illumination of Local Experience in Maṅkha’s Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* (M.A. Thesis). University of California Berkeley.
- Gonda, Jan (1966): *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hiltebeitel, Alf (1990): *The Ritual of Battle: Krishna in the Mahābhārata*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kinsley, David R. (1988): *Hindu Goddesses: Visions of the Divine Feminine in the Hindu Religious Traditions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Klebanov, Andrey (2020): “Application of Structure Analysis to the Study of Sanskrit Commentaries on *mahākāvya*. A General Overview of the Subject with a Special Reference to the Commentaries on the *Kirātārjunīya*”. In: *The commentary Idioms of the Tamil Learned Traditions*. Edited by Anandakichenin, S., and D’Avella, V. B. Pondichery: Institut Français, 524–590.
- Kreyenborg, Elizabeth (1929): *Der XXV Gesang des Śrīkaṇṭhacaritam. Ein Beitrag zur altindischen Literaturgeschichte*. Münster: Philos-Diss.
- Livio, Chiara (2018): “Cosmic Pūjā. Śivabhakti in Śrīkaṇṭhacarita V”. *Indologica Taurinensia* 43/44 (2): 261–84.
- Livio, Chiara (2019): “Devotee, King and Creator: Kailāsa as ποιητής in Śrīkaṇṭhacarita IV”. In: *Puṣpikā, Tracing Ancient India, through Texts and Traditions*. Edited by Heleen De Jonckheere, Marie-Hélène Gorisse and Agnieszka Rostalska. Oxford: Oxbow Books: 69–94.
- Livio, Chiara (2020): “A Poet with His Philosopher’s Hat On. A Preliminary Study of the Philosophical Section in the Seventeenth Canto of Maṅkha’s Śrīkaṇṭhacarita”. *Religions of South Asia* 14 (1): 11–40.
- Mandal, Bankim Chandra (1991): *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.
- McCrea, Lawrence (2020): “Poetry in Chains. Commentary and Control in the Sanskrit Poetic Tradition”. In: *Language, Ritual and Poetics in Ancient India and Iran*. Edited by Shulman, D. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 231–248.
- Obrock, Luther J. (2015): *Translation and History: The Development of a Kashmiri Textual Tradition from ca. 1000–1500* (Ph.D. Thesis). UC Berkeley: South & Southeast Asian Studies.

- Olivelle, Patrick (2013): *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India. Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. A New Annotated Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Renou, Louis (1928): *Le Raghuvaṃśa (La Lignée des Fils du Soleil). Poème en XIX Chants*. Paris: Edition Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1984): *Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭāpatha on the Kirātārjunīya, I–IV*. Leiden: Brill.
- Slaje, Walter (2014): *Kingship in Kaśmīr (AD 1148–1459): from the pen of Jonarāja, Court Paṇḍit to Sulṭān Zayn al-'Ābidīn*. Halle an der Saale: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittenberg.
- Slaje, Walter (2015): *Bacchanal in Himmel und andere Proben aus Maṅkha*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Tubb, Gary A. / Boose, Emery R. (2007): *Scholastic Sanskrit. A Handbook for Students*. New York: The American Institute of Buddhist Studies.