

expressed by those terms, relying in great part on the epics and the Arthaśāstra. The third chapter, “Elephant Knowledge,” treats the practicalities of keeping and training elephants from the ground up—food, handlers, etc.—based on the specialized treatises on elephant science and, again, the Arthaśāstra as well as the much later *Ā'in-i Akbarī*.

The second major section, “The Spread of the War Elephant,” first treats the spread within greater India, to “North India, South India, Sri Lanka.” The spread began with the rise of Magadha, whose location gave it privileged access to the eastern elephant forests and enabled it to incorporate organized war elephants into its army, further facilitating its conquest of much of north India, spreading the institution of the war elephant beyond its origins (a spread later continued in the succeeding Mauryan empire). This northwestern spread resulted in Alexander’s encounter with Indian armies with elephants and eventually encouraged the importation of the war elephant into the Near East and the European and North African Mediterranean regions, a development treated in the following chapter. Utilizing literary sources, Trautmann then briefly provides evidence for a similar spread to South India and, in more detail, relying on the *Mahāvamsa*, to Sri Lanka.

The second chapter of this section, “The Near East, North Africa, Europe,” gives us a whirlwind tour of elephants and Alexander, the Seleucids, the Ptolomies, the Carthaginians, the Greeks and Romans, the Sassanians, and the Ghaznavids. Emphasized throughout is the problem of supply: there being no longer any native elephants in most of those parts, new war elephants had to be obtained from India (by ruler-to-ruler gift or capture in war, generally) and the specialized knowledge of their care either carried by native Indian handlers who accompanied their large charges or transmitted to locals by such people. That the prestige value and military effect of elephants were considered enough to outweigh the considerable difficulties of obtaining and keeping them is little short of remarkable.

These practical problems were far less acute going in the other direction, covered in the last chapter of this section, “Southeast Asia,” for wild elephants were plentiful in those territories. But Trautmann makes the important point that, despite this abundance, capturing and training war elephants came quite late (1st c. C.E.) to Southeast Asia and only arose when the model of Indian kingship was imported to this area (p. 262 and passim)—necessitating a digression into “the vexed issue of *Indianized states*” (starting p. 262), which leads to a succinct sketch of the poetics and ideology of Southeast Asian kingship in this period. In a certain way Southeast Asia is the limiting case for Trautmann’s thesis, that (Indian-style) kings and (war) elephants are, as it were, two sides of the same coin, and the presence of elephants is not enough to produce the sociological phenomenon.

The book ends with the third section, “After the War Elephant,” whose single chapter, “Drawing the Balance, Looking Ahead,” presents a fairly bleak picture of the fate of elephants after kingship as an institution disappeared in the modern era.

The term “page-turner” is seldom applied to books in our field, but *Elephants & Kings* certainly deserves it. Yet the ease and pleasure of reading it should not distract the reader from the persuasive arguments and innovative points made about the accidental but persistent interdependence between the great beast (elephant) and the great man (king).

STEPHANIE W. JAMISON  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

---

*Choix d'articles.* By GÉRARD FUSSMAN. Edited by Denis Matringe, Éric Ollivier, and Isabelle Szelagowski. École française d'Extrême-Orient, Réimpressions no. 14. Paris: ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT, 2014. Pp. 598. €40.

This monumental collection consists of a selection of thirteen out of the author’s innumerable articles, chosen by him on the grounds that they “pour des raisons diverses, me paraissent importants ou typiques de ma manière” (p. 15). This explanation comes in the introductory section entitled “Quelques explications” (pp. 13–27), in which Fussman provides a biographical summary of his professional

career, explaining in the process the circumstances under which each of the selected articles came to be written, as well as reminding us that—as all senior scholars know well—“successions de hasards font les carrières” (p. 15).

The topics of the chosen articles amply demonstrate Fussman’s long-established expertise in a variety of subjects, including Indian history (“Quelques problèmes aśokéens,” 1974; “Pouvoir central et régions dans l’Inde ancienne: Le problème de l’empire maurya,” 1982/4; “L’Indo-grec Ménandre ou Paul Demiéville revisité,” 1993; “The Riddle of the Ancient Indian Eras Is Not Yet Solved,” 2011); the history of religion (“Pour une problématique nouvelle des religions indiennes anciennes,” 1977); art history (“Numismatic and Epigraphic Evidence for the Chronology of Early Gandharan Art,” 1987); Buddhism (“Symbolisms of the Buddhist *Stūpa*,” 1986; “Upāya-kauśalya: L’implantation du bouddhisme au Gandhāra,” 1994; “La place des *Sukhāvati-vyūha* dans le bouddhisme indien,” 1999); and, last but not least, “mes premières amours” (p. 19), namely archaeology and epigraphy (“Documents épigraphiques kouchanes (III). L’inscription kharoṣṭhī de Senavarma, roi d’Oḍi: Une nouvelle lecture,” 1982; “Cours: Les premières systèmes d’écriture en Inde,” 1988–89; “L’inscription de Rabatak et l’origine de l’ère *śaka*,” 1998). The remaining article is an obituary: “Nécrologie—Georges Dumézil (4 mars 1898—11 octobre 1986).” A brief section of “*Errata* et suppléments” (pp. 575–83) provides updates on more recent publications relevant to the reprinted articles.

The selection proves—if any proof were needed—the author’s wide and deep knowledge of the history, archaeology, literature, and culture of the Indo-Iranian world in general and of the north-western frontier and the adjoining borderlands of the Irano-Afghan world in particular. Fussman’s self-selection of articles includes both some of his best-known and most influential pieces, such as the classic “Upāya-kauśalya: L’implantation du bouddhisme au Gandhāra,” as well as a few lesser-known works such as “Pour une problématique nouvelle des religions indiennes anciennes.” In his preliminary remarks he describes the latter as “un article que je voulais provocateur et qui tomba entièrement à plat . . . aucun indianiste n’y répondit” (p. 19), so that one gets the impression that the author hopes to give this article—in which he concedes that he was “Peut-être . . . trop audacieux dans nos conclusions” (p. 101)—a chance to be reconsidered by Indologists.

Fussman’s methodological principles are best summed up in his own words: he strives to “tirer le maximum d’informations sûres des documents dont nous disposons et s’interdire les extrapolations hasardeuses” (p. 25). He is ruthlessly and unashamedly positivist in his approach; for example, with regard to the issue of early evidence for a cult of Amitābha, “Il me paraît en effet plus sain de dire à quoi correspondent les données incomplètes mais réelles que nous possédons plutôt que de profiter de l’absence de témoignages pour laisser libre cours à mon imagination” (p. 482 n. 65). The application of these principles results in scrupulously detailed and often quite lengthy articles which furnish comprehensive and penetrating analyses of primary sources, all with a trademark dose of skepticism arising from “un esprit hypercritique comme le nôtre” (p. 59).

This volume confirms Gérard Fussman’s legacy as, among his other achievements, the godfather of the modern era of Gandhāran studies. His pioneering editions of many Kharoṣṭhī/Gāndhārī inscriptions which came to light around the end of the twentieth century both laid the foundation of and set the standard for the now-burgeoning field of Gāndhārī studies. In this and related fields he was and remains a force to be reckoned with. For example, the long-standing controversy as to the date of Kaniṣka’s accession is a thread that runs through many of the articles in this collection. While conceding that “Almost everybody now agrees than [*sic*] year 1 of Kaniṣka should be placed in A.D. 127, as admittedly demonstrated by H. Falk” (p. 528), Fussman remains resolutely unmoved by the winds of scholarly opinion, declining to abandon the old theory that Kaniṣka’s era is the same reckoning as the Śaka era of 78 C.E. His position on this issue has however softened somewhat: in 1987 he declared that “I still hold for 78” (p. 200), whereas in 2011 he concluded that the 78 date is “at least . . . as good a hypothesis as Falk’s” (p. 533). Only time will tell whether he is fighting a rear-guard action against an inevitable revision, or rather refusing to jump onto a passing bandwagon.

The situation is similar with regard to “the omitted hundreds theory” (which underlies Falk’s theory that Kaniṣka’s era began in 127), according to which some epigraphic dates in the era of Kaniṣka have to be understood as referring to a second century with the hundreds figure omitted. Here too, the theory

is now widely accepted by most authorities, but not by Fussman (pp. 204, 216 n. 24, 533–55), who characteristically holds out for a higher standard of proof. Again, future discoveries may yield a definitive verdict; although I personally subscribe to the omitted hundreds theory, it is not out of the question that Fussman's reservations may one day prove justified.

These and other controversies aside, this volume is a fitting tribute to a momentous and influential career. It will provide an illuminating experience for all readers, whether they are studying these articles for the first time or, as in my case, are reviewing articles which have been read many times before but continue to provide new insights.

RICHARD SALOMON  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

---

*Kingship in Kaśmīr (AD 1148–1459), from the Pen of Jonarāja, Court Paṇḍit to Sulṭān Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, Critically Edited with Annotated Translation, Indexes and Maps.* By WALTER SLAJE. *Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis*, vol. 7. Halle an der Saale: UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG HALLE-WITTENBERG, 2014. Pp. 326, 1 pl, maps. €78.

This thorough, well-executed volume offers a definitive treatment of Jonarāja's famed—but regrettably understudied—*Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (JRT). Included in the book, which was first slated to appear in the now-defunct Clay Sanskrit Library, are a critical edition and translation of the text, a detailed bibliography, four useful maps, an Index of Names and Terms, and a comprehensive Toponymical Index. More than 750 notes to the translation—almost one per verse—explain the cultural and other implications of particular passages of the text, etymologies of particular terms used, and the known biographical particulars of various figures mentioned; they also offer details regarding the places in and around the Valley to which Jonarāja refers and explain some of the author's translation choices.

The critical edition builds on that of Srikanth Kaul, which was published in 1967 in Hoshiarpur (Vishveshvaranand Institute Publication 432 = Woolner Indological Series 7). Slaje collates the readings of five manuscripts and adds them to those of the six collated by Kaul, and his positive apparatus includes the readings of Kaul's edition, which is "converted from its original negative to the inferred positive shape" (p. 47). Slaje also follows Kaul in helpfully distinguishing between two principal recensions of the text, differentiating Jonarāja's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* from that of a Pseudo-Jonarāja (Ps-JRT), the latter found in evidence in only one *devanāgarī* manuscript ("D") that is housed at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute and, prior to Kaul's revisions, was first edited by P. Peterson in 1896 (Bombay Sanskrit Series 54). Pseudo-Jonarāja adds some 358 verses to the 976 of the JRT (itself preserved in nine *sāradā* manuscripts)—additions that, as Slaje argues, are historically reliable (see p. 42 n. 56) and fill out the narrative in occasionally significant ways (e.g., Ps-JRT B1029–1033ab).

The critical apparatus was carefully prepared and is easy to use. Variants are helpfully recorded in italics (with lemmas in a regular font), so that one can scan the readings with relative ease. Glosses found in various manuscripts are duly noted, and Kaul's emendations are also documented, whether they were adopted in the present edition or not (as are the very occasional emendations of others, such as that of A. Aklujkar at JRT 828b). On the other hand, "clearly recognizable scribal blunders" and "unconvincing emendations and corrections as well as erroneous compounding or separation of words by Kaul are not reproduced" herein (pp. 48–49). Slaje offers (by my count) some two dozen helpful emendations and conjectural emendations of his own, including several conjectures that improve Pseudo-Jonarāja's text—this despite the fact that none of the manuscripts he collated gives witness to that added text. (Of these my only quibble is that Slaje is sometimes too modest in noting his interventions: his conjectures could occasionally be counted more rightly as emendations proper [e.g., at JRT 664c: *jīvanarakatā* → *jīvanarakatām*].) The additional manuscripts examined allow Slaje successfully to identify two distinct manuscript families, labeled [Ś<sub>2/10</sub>] and [Ś<sub>5/9</sub>], respectively (see pp. 42–47). The product is a substantially more fluid and accurate edition, though an exhaustive comparison of all the readings selected by Slaje and Kaul respectively lies beyond the scope of this review.