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—*Rājataraṅgiṇī* (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 *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 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 *śāradā* 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: *jīvannarakatā* → *jīvannarakatāṃ*].) The additional manuscripts examined allow Slaje successfully to identify two distinct manuscript families, labeled [$\acute{S}_{2/10}$] and [$\acute{S}_{5/9}$], 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.

Slaje's careful textual scholarship and highly accurate English translation open the way for further analysis of Jonarāja's contribution. Indeed, his work furnishes an immeasurable improvement on J. C. Dutt's 1898 English rendering, which is based on a shaky edition of the original Sanskrit text. Noteworthy, first of all, is the fact that many of the concerns found in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (RT) reappear in Jonarāja's text: good governance—the king's ability to deliver stability and prosperity to the Valley—remains *the* central concern of the work. And the marks of good government echo those found in the RT: On the positive side of the ledger Jonarāja recounts numerous episodes of the endowment of *maṭha*s (e.g., JRT 111, 115, 869) and the founding of towns (e.g., JRT 410), royal support for scholars and artists, the commissioning of irrigation and other development projects (e.g., JRT 860–68), the administration of justice with wisdom (e.g., JRT 786–93), and the support of Brahmins (e.g., JRT 879); on the other side of the ledger the scourge of famine (e.g., JRT 358), the sovereign's abuse of his (or her) own people for personal gain, and the tussles associated with royal succession define corrupted political rule and are found in ample evidence in Jonarāja's narrative.

The style of Jonarāja's text is similarly reminiscent of Kalhaṇa's: myth is sometimes interspersed with historical narrative (though far less so here than in Kalhaṇa) (see, e.g., JRT 561–66), gnomic verses are scattered throughout the work (e.g., JRT 543), and Jonarāja in some places even mirrors Kalhaṇa's concentrated style of composition, though in my view without the degree of mastery put in evidence by his predecessor (compare the use of the instrumental, e.g., at JRT 74 and RT 6.14).

A couple of episodes that exemplify the major themes in question are worthy of further note. First, Jonarāja in one place speaks autobiographically of the sovereign's virtue: swindlers tried to steal his lands by surreptitiously modifying a document of sale, but Sulṭān Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn (r. 1418–1419, 1420–1470) cleverly had the birch-bark document dipped in water, bleeding away the fraudulent pen strokes and returning the document to its unaltered form, which showed one plot of land and not ten included in the sale in question (JRT vv. 801–8 and pp. 208–11 of this volume). (So much here clearly echoes an episode found in Kalhaṇa [RT 6.14ff.], where king Yaśaskara [r. 939–948] deciphers a bill of sale that was similarly modified.) Second, and more provocatively, Jonarāja offers a narrative account of the fate of Kalhaṇa's descendants: having turned to evil they murdered King Saṅgrāmadeva (r. 1236–1252), who himself was described as "a tree granting the poets [all] their wishes, the branches of which towered up into the remotest parts of the sky" (*śākhākrāntadigantas sa . . . kavikalpadrumo rājā*) (JRT v. 102, pp. 70–71). Saṅgrāmadeva's son, Rāmadeva (r. 1252–1273), then took his revenge, killing his father's murderers (JRT v. 105). This episode is somewhat puzzling to me; for even if one accepts it as pure historical fact, dutifully reported by a historically minded Jonarāja, it is surprising that the demise of Kalhaṇa's lineage passes into the text without further comment or explanation, particularly given the praise Jonarāja heaped on Kalhaṇa himself (at, e.g., JRT 26). The passage begs for scholarly interpretation—and Slaje's book renders such interpretive endeavors possible.

This is not to say the two *Rājataraṅgiṇī*s in question are without their significant differences. First of all, Śaivism is more pronouncedly ascendant among Hindu traditions in the JRT, which of course reflects contemporaneous events on the ground; and the text evidently records the appearance of Nāth Yogis/Siddhas in Kashmir in a way that the RT does not (see, e.g., p. 163).

The most prominent difference of course involves the growing prevalence of Islam in the Valley, which is greeted in the JRT, in my view, as both something new and as something akin to what preceded it. Reference to two world-views (JRT 768–70)—one Hindu (the term *hinduka* is used at, e.g., JRT 442 and 462), one Muslim—and the furnishing of a new *maṅgala* verse with the advent of the first Muslim ruler of the Valley (JRT 308, cf. n. 286) exemplify the various ways in which the JRT explicitly marks Islam as different. So, too, does reference to Muslim learning as corrupting of political rulers (e.g., JRT 590–94, including and especially Ps-JRT B747), sometimes leading them toward an intolerance explicitly said to be traceable to the corrupting influence of Harṣa, a Turuṣka who imported barbarism and iconoclasm to the Valley (JRT 597–600). But in other places Jonarāja seems to wish to emphasize a certain cultural continuity. Thus, honoring Brahmins accrues merit even to a Muslim king (e.g., JRT 772), and in one place Brahmins are even commissioned by the Sulṭān to perform a *sattra* to combat famine (JRT 528, cf. n. 419). Still elsewhere, the Sulṭān's three sons are said respectively to embody *dharma*, *artha*, and *kāma* (JRT 586–87). Islam can be, it seems, epiphenomenal to the prosecution of good governance.

For this reason—if there is any place I could find reason to criticize this excellent volume—I find some of Slaje's translation choices to be somewhat rash. He occasionally "Islamizes" the text in translation, choosing "Muslim" to render *mleccha* (e.g., JRT 762, 820) or "scimitar" to render *khaḍga* (Ps-JRT B1126), for example— this in line with Kaul's understanding of *yavana*s as *ʿulamās* (see p. 277 n. 464). I am simply not sure that Jonarāja always wished to be so specific in such instances: perhaps *mleccha*s were only barbarians, and no particular religious identity was meant to be specified.

But this is truly a minor concern. This is exemplary scholarship, and other scholars will rightly turn to Slaje's reliable contribution for many decades to come. One can only hope that he meets his promise (at p. 5) to deliver a follow-up to the present work, namely, an edition and rendering of Śrīvara's *Zaynataraṅgiṇī* in a future publication. If it will be at all like the present volume, we shall be very lucky to have it when he does.

John Nemec
University of Virginia

Hindu Theology in Early Modern South Asia: The Rise of Devotionalism and the Politics of Genealogy. By Kiyokazu Okita. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. vii + 284. $99 (cloth).

It is well known that the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas connect themselves to the Mādhva Vaiṣṇava tradition in their own accounts of their lineage. Immediately after Vyāsa, said to be the composer of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, comes Madhva (1238–1317 A.D.), Vyāsatīrtha (c. 1400), and other leading theologians in the Dvaita tradition, followed by important figures in the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition, from Caitanya (early sixteenth century), Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja (sixteenth century), Viśvanātha Cakravartin (early eighteenth century) to Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa (mid eighteenth century). This connection between the Mādhvas and Gauḍīyas is recorded in editions of Kavi Karṇpura's *Gauragaṇoddeśadīpikā* (1576 A.D.); while John Stratton Hawley doubts the authenticity of the lineage in this text, seeing it as a later interpolation, Okita thinks, "thorough manuscript research is required to make the interpolation hypothesis convincing" (p. 47). In Okita's view it is still an open debate as to whether Karṇapura's text was the *first* to establish the Gauḍīya and Mādhva link. Nevertheless, given that we do have a reliable Gauḍīya and Mādhva linkage in the *Bhaktiratnākara* of Narahari Cakravartin in the seventeenth century, it was likely known and established *before* the time of Baladeva, the theologian who is the subject of this book. The goal of this book is to critically investigate what the lineage found in editions of Karṇapura's text amounts to, thus clarifying the Gauḍīya's relationship to the Mādhvas.

The problematic nature of this connection was not lost to contemporary Mādhva scholars; scathing critiques appeared on the Internet in the early 2000s from Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha, a Mādhva scholar and religious leader. Thus, there were unsettled questions about the legitimacy of this lineage from various quarters. The specific role of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was also doubted; as a trained Mādhva he brought that training to bear in his theological writings, especially in his use of the term *viśeṣa*, or "differentiating capacity," the key term Dvaitins use to characterize God's relationship with qualities, and in his non-use of the term *acintya-bheda-abheda*, "paradoxical oneness and difference," a cornerstone of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theology on God's relationship with qualities. For this reason O. B. L. Kapoor (1909–2001), a prolific disciple of Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Svāmin, the leading Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava religious leader and scholar in the early twentieth century, argued, "Baladeva does not represent the true spirit of Śrī Caitanya" (Kapoor 1976: 171, quoted by Okita p. 246). On the basis of these concerns Okita seeks to clarify Baladeva's relation with Mādhva tradition and in doing so illuminate the political forces that influenced Baladeva's writing.

Okita presents us with a rigorous and objective study of how and when the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava *saṃpradāya* lineage was constructed, as well as a philologically grounded study of Baladeva's thought in relation to his primary predecessors, especially Śaṅkara, Śrīdhara Svāmin, Madhva, Vijayadhvaja, and Jīva Gosvāmin. This is a very important contribution to our understanding of the formative period of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava thought between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.