

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 *khadga* (Ps-JRT B1126), for example—this in line with Kaul’s understanding of *yavanas* as *‘ulamās* (see p. 277 n. 464). I am simply not sure that Jonarāja always wished to be so specific in such instances: perhaps *mlecchas* 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 *Zaynatarāṅgiṇī* 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.), Vyāsātīrtha (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 Karṇapura’s *Gauraṅgaṇodeśadīpikā* (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 *sampradāya* 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.

Okita's "Introduction" delineates the concerns he hopes to address, for example J. N. Farquhar's view that early modern South Asia—Baladeva's own lifetime—was a "dark age." It remains unclear that Baladeva would speak to the concerns—however sectarian—of the mainstream Protestant values that motivated Farquhar. But I return to this below. Okita also discusses his own conception of theology, presumably because his book is published with Oxford University Press's "Theology & Religion Monograph Series," but also because of recent discussions of this term by Francis Clooney, Paul Muller-Ortega, and me. Okita positions himself not as an insider or theologian, but as a historian of South Asian intellectual thought.

The first chapter outlines other political factors that may have influenced Baladeva's writing. This is the reign of Jaisingh II (r. 1700–43) in the Kachvāhā dynasty, situated in Jaipur. At that time the deity Govindadeva had been moved to Jaipur from Vṛndāvana to escape the iconoclastic Islamic ruler Arangzeb, bringing with it the attention of Vaiṣṇavas in the surrounds. As Jaisingh rose in power, so did the pressures placed on various religious traditions to respond to his concerns, which for the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas involved clarifying their views on Kṛṣṇa's possibly contentious relationship with Rādhā, their *saṃpradāya* affiliation, and their lack of a *Brahmasūtra* commentary. Okita discusses each of these topics.

The second chapter introduces a distinction that grounds Okita's understanding of Baladeva's *saṃpradāya* affiliation. The first is *formal affiliation* or "membership" within a tradition by ritual initiation (*dikṣā*) and the second is *theological affiliation* by receiving scriptural knowledge (*śikṣā*) from a teacher (p. 41). The guru who gives *dikṣā* and the guru who gives *śikṣā* can be different people, and furthermore they can even be from different traditions; thus an individual can receive affiliation from two different traditions. Okita's argument is that Baladeva had formal affiliation with the Mādhvas by ritual initiation from a time in his life before encountering the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas (he also looks at other major people in the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition and their possible formal affiliation with the Mādhvas). Baladeva, however, had theological affiliation with the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas through his study of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and Jīva Gosvāmin's comments thereupon with a Kānyakubja Brāhmaṇa and leading Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava scholar named Rādhādāmodara Dāsa in Puri, Orissa, and perhaps with Viśvanātha Cakravartin in Vṛndāvana (although I think it is still not clear how much time they would have had together).

Are the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas part of the Mādhva *saṃpradāya*? The question can now be parsed into two: do they have a *dikṣā* or a *śikṣā* affiliation? Put differently: is their linkage with the Mādhvas through *dikṣā* or *śikṣā*, or both, or neither? As noted, Okita thinks that Baladeva did not invent the Mādhva *dikṣā* affiliation with the Gauḍīyas; he even had it himself, and it did exist before his time. We do not know much more beyond that. He argues that there was probably never any substantial *śikṣā* or theological connection between the Mādhvas and Gauḍīyas. Thus, the construction of a Mādhva-Gauḍīya *dikṣā saṃpradāya* existed before Baladeva, and a Mādhva-Gauḍīya *śikṣā saṃpradāya* never existed in any substantial manner. The remainder of the book attempts to demonstrate this, especially the second claim.

Chapter three attempts to clarify the *śikṣā* or theological relationship between Jīva Gosvāmin (a major and early Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theologian two centuries prior to Baladeva) and Mādhva theology by looking at the commentaries on the so-called *catuḥśloki bhāgavata* (Bhāgavata Purāṇa 2.9.32–35) of Jīva Gosvāmin, Śrīdhara Svāmin, Madhva, and Vijayadhvaḥ. These are dense and sophisticated verses that lend themselves to elaborate interpretation. Through careful textual examination, Okita demonstrates that Jīva Gosvāmin developed his own interpretations of these verses based on his theology of *acintya-bheda-abheda*, the "paradoxical oneness and difference" of the Lord and his powers (*śakti-s*). Okita's use of "paradoxical" for *acintya*, a translation first introduced by Alessandro Graheli, is a great improvement over the standard "inconceivable" that is more generally used. Jīva often reads the verses in a way that "follows" Śrīdhara Svāmin's form of Advaita when and if there is no contradiction with his own thought; while this is already something well known in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava studies, Okita demonstrates that Jīva rarely follows or even acknowledges Madhva, even though he was aware of his commentary. Okita argues that Jīva "strives to demonstrate his conformity" with Śrīdhara Svāmin, even when offering a different reading of a verse, but he does *not* worry about diverging from Madhva (p. 105). As to why Jīva Gosvāmin worked this way, Okita does not speculate. Yet it would make sense

if the notion of a Gauḍīya and Mādhva connection did not exist in Jīva Gosvāmin's time. Perhaps the reason Jīva Gosvāmin makes such pained overtures to Śrīdhara Svāmin is that Caitanya had most likely instructed his early disciples to respect Śrīdhara Svāmin's work.

At the conclusion of this analysis Okita suggests that, on the issue of God's relationship with the world and souls, Jīva Gosvāmin is nearest to yet another person, Rāmānuja. He says this because Śrīdhara Svāmin emphasized Advaita (the *abheda* part), whereas Madhva emphasized Dvaita (the *bheda* part), but Rāmānuja spoke of *viśiṣṭādvaita*, the "non-duality of the one with qualities," thus giving both the *abheda* and the *bheda*. Jīva Gosvāmin makes the relationship paradoxical, *acintya*. Does it follow from Okita's framework that the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theology is *theologically affiliated* with the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition? Okita suggests that Jīva Gosvāmin's notion of the difference between the self or soul (*jīva*) and the Lord (*bhagavat*) may "echo" Madhva's, but of course this could just as easily come from Rāmānuja, who argues for the non-duality of three distinct entities: the unconscious world, the *jīva*-s, and the *bhagavat*.

The importance of chapter three for his argument is that it establishes the context for looking at Baladeva's comments on the *Brahmasūtra*. Taking Jīva Gosvāmin as his primary reference point for Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theology, Okita is able to look at the relationship between Jīva Gosvāmin, Madhva, and Baladeva. He can thereby determine the theological (*śikṣā*) affiliation of Baladeva. Okita says that although Baladeva included terminology from Madhva (and did not emphasize key terms from Jīva Gosvāmin, as discussed below), nevertheless Baladeva is "theologically affiliated" with Jīva Gosvāmin and the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition more broadly, despite his prior and formal affiliation (*dikṣā*) with the Mādhvas.

Why would Baladeva use Mādhva terms? Okita writes that he "consciously utilized the Mādhva terminologies in order to give credibility to the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, which he was trying to establish" (p. 61). The pressure had come from Jaisingh II, who wanted to see a *saṃpradāya* for the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, and it seems Okita is arguing that Baladeva's writing is therefore *politically* motivated, that he masked the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theology in Mādhva terms. Okita does not answer the question: does the said political motivation of Baladeva's work undermine its contribution to the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theology itself?

Chapter four, the longest chapter, concludes his argument by providing a detailed analysis of Baladeva's *Govindabhāṣya* (his *Brahmasūtra* commentary) in relation to the commentaries of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, and Jīva (Jīva did not comment on the *Brahmasūtra* itself, but did comment on many of the sūtras under examination in his *Sandarbhās*). On the issue of Brahman's relationship with qualities, Madhva used *viśeṣa* or "differentiating capacity" to explain why Brahman can have multiple qualities without losing its fundamental unity, and Jīva Gosvāmin accepts something near to Rāmānuja's *viśiṣṭādvaita*. Baladeva also used the term *viśeṣa*. But does it follow that Baladeva's use of *viśeṣa* means that he agrees with Madhva and disagrees with Jīva (and by extension Rāmānuja)? Okita argues it does *not* follow because the "difference between Baladeva and Jīva in this regard seems terminological rather than substantial" (p. 252). This seems to be the crux of Okita's argument and contribution; therefore we might wish he would have used a more emphatic term than "seems." Okita is thus suggesting, but not without some reservation, that Baladeva's language can be distinguished from his underlying *theology*, from which it follows that one theology can be expressed in *two different* sets of terms.

Okita makes an important discovery. The "six indicatory marks" (*tātparyaliṅga*) (e.g., examining the introduction and conclusion of a book) used by Jīva Gosvāmin and Baladeva to make sense of scriptural texts is generally said to have come from Mīmāṃsā, but this is not true; he shows it most likely comes from Madhva and it was used later in Sadānanda's well-known *Vedāntasāra* (p. 175–76). While this is a critical historical study, one that will surely upturn how scholars think about the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition, one should not expect a philosophical or critical *assessment* of Baladeva's work. Baladeva used mythical items like the *vaidurya* gem (a stone that has many colors) to describe God's being (is it fitting or ironic that a unknown gem is used to describe an unknown God?) and he refers to mystical geologies like that of Meru to make his points, but an evaluation of these arguments in light of modern philosophy and geology, or even the sciences in Baladeva's own time, is not provided. It is at points like these that a response to Farquhar would have been interesting.

Okita does not assess the relative strengths of Madhva's, Jīva's, Baladeva's, etc., arguments and interpretations, but maps them out and compares them. There seems to be an unspoken *pūrvapakṣa* running through the analysis: that we should expect theologians with the same theological affiliation to hold the same views on essential topics. This assumption is not evaluated.

In conclusion, this is a rich source of information on the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition, with careful philological and comparative argumentation. It makes an important contribution to our understanding of Baladeva's role in the history of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition and establishes a firm foundation and critical methodology for further comparative studies within the Vaiṣṇava traditions of theology.

JONATHAN EDELMANN
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Bhāṭṭatantrarahasyam: The Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya of Khaṇḍadeva with the Sāraprakāśikā Commentary by N. S. Ramanuja Tatacharya. By N. S. RAMANUJA TATACHARYA. Regards sur l'Asie du Sud/South Asian Perspective, no. 4. Pondichéry: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY, 2015. Pp. xxi + 664. Rs. 1200, €52.

The eminent polymath N. S. Ramanuja Tatacharya has made many contributions to scholarship on Sanskrit writings in several areas of learning, particularly Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, and Vyākaraṇa. Among his recent contributions are a four-volume compilation (*Śābdabodhamīmāṃsā: An Inquiry into Indian Theories of Verbal Cognition*) published by the Institut Français de Pondichéry between 2005 and 2008, in which are collected major selections of works dealing with aspects of verbal cognition; a commentary (*Bālapriyā*) on Nilakaṇṭha's *Prakāśikā* to Annambhaṭṭa's *Tarkasaṅgrahadīpikā* (*The Tarka-saṅgraha-Dīpikā-Prakāśikā with the Commentaries Bālapriyā and Prasāraṇā*, 2nd ed., edited by N. Veezhinathan, [Chennai Mahalakshmi-Mathrubhuteswar Trust, 2008]); and an edition of Gadādharaḥaṭṭa's *Vyutpattivāda* with his commentary *Vidvanmanoramā* (*Tārkikacakraḥvartī Gadādharaḥaṭṭācāryaviracitaḥ Vyutpattivādaḥ N. S. Rāmānujācāryakṛtāyā Vidvanmanoramākhyayā vyākhyayā sahitaḥ*, 2 vol. [Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidya-peetha, 2011, 2012]).

Ramanuja Tatacharya has now contributed an edition of the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya* of the Mīmāṃsaka Khaṇḍadeva, with his commentary, *Sāraprakāśikā*. The text and commentary (pp. 1–640) are preceded by a short introduction (*prastāvanā*, i-v) as well as a detailed table of contents (vii-xxi, where the order of the first two indexes is reversed), and followed by four appendixes: index of Pāṇinian sūtras (*pāṇinisūtrasūci*, 643–52) and vārttikas of Kātyāyana (*vārttikāni*, 652–53) quoted both in the main text and in the commentary, index of kārikās cited in the main text and commentary (*kārikāsūci*, 655–57), and a catalog of works cited (*udāhṛtagranthānām sūci*, 659–64).

Khaṇḍadeva, who received the name Śrīdharendra when he took sannyaṣa, flourished in Kāśī in the early to mid seventeenth century and died in 1666 (samvat 1722), as is made known by his disciple Śambhubhaṭṭa in the seventh and ninth verses at the end of his *Prabhāvalī* on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* (*yaḥ khaṇḍadevanāmā san śrīdharendrābhīdhām gataḥ | sa gurur me vijānātu tīkākr̥tipariśramam || varṣe netradvisaptadvijapatigāṇite māsi jyeṣṭhe karakṣe . . . kāśyām śrībrahmanāle nirupamacaritaḥ khaṇḍadevābhīdhānaḥ | prāptaḥ śrībrahmadbhāvaṃ nibudhavaraguruḥ śrīdharendro yatīndraḥ ||*).

Khaṇḍadeva is known to have composed three works on Mīmāṃsā: *Mīmāṃsākaustubha*, *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*, *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya*. The first is a commentary extending from the second pāda of the first adhyāya through the third pāda of the third adhyāya of Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*. The *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* covers from the second pāda of the first adhyāya through the twelfth adhyāya. There are earlier editions of the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya*. A. Subrahmanya Sastri's edition (3rd ed. [as mentioned on p. 74 of the Sanskrit introduction], Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1970) includes an extensive Sanskrit introduction of seventy-five pages, a shorter English introduction of ten pages, comments on some