

points out that the nearest equivalence to free-will is *svātantrya*, 'independence' which 'suggests the capacity for self determined action' and *cikīrṣa*, 'desire to act' as analogous to 'will' (p. 3), although these terms do not appear very much in the later essays (*svātantrya* occurs in essays by Lawrence, Ganeri, Buchta and Dasti, *cikīrṣa* only in Dasti's essays, and the noun *svatantra* is discussed by Cardona). Prompted by this discussion, I did an electronic search of Sanskrit texts available to me, to find almost two thousand occurrence of *svātantrya* and seventy or so of *cikīrṣa* in over a hundred texts of Philosophy, Śaivism, Pāñcarātra and Yoga, particularly notable occurrences being in Abhinavagupta's philosophical oeuvre. Clearly *svātantrya* is a significant term and much work could be done on its analysis.

The essays in this book are written predominantly, although not exclusively, by scholars of Indian religions rather than philosophers as such, but the book is nevertheless a fine thematic study that will be extremely useful on philosophy and religion courses at both undergraduate and graduate level. To my knowledge this is the first thematic study of free-will in Indian philosophy and the editors Dasti and Bryant should be congratulated on their achievement.

Gavin Flood FBA

University of Oxford & Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies

doi:10.1093/jhs/hiw008

Advance Access Publication 13 April 2016

***Hindu Theology in Early Modern South Asia: The Rise of Devotionalism and the Politics of Genealogy.* By Kiyokazu Okita. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. ISBN: 978-0-19-870926-8. pp. xvi, 284. £65.00 (hardback).**

For decades scholars have been puzzled by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, an 18th-century Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theologian who is best known as the author of the *Govinda-bhāṣya*, the first full commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras* in the Gauḍīya tradition. Before he became a Gauḍīya, Baladeva was a Mādhva ascetic, and in his writings he not only claimed that the Gauḍīya tradition founded by Caitanya descended from the tradition of Mādhva, but also built his thought on Mādhva concepts and exegesis. Many scholars have seen Baladeva as a Mādhva 'opportunist' (p. 58), who taught Mādhva, rather than Gauḍīya, Vedānta, and desired to gain influence over this new religious tradition. As *Hindu Theology in Early Modern South Asia* demonstrates, however, Baladeva's thinking, while clearly marked by his Mādhva training, is thoroughly Gauḍīya, and perfectly illustrates the intellectual vigour and creativity of Vedāntic debate in pre-colonial South Asia.

To understand Baladeva's complex thought, Okita argues, we need to read him in the light of the debates that took place at the Jaipur court. These are outlined in Chapter One ('Historical Background'), which traces the history between the Kachvāhā dynasty and the Gauḍīyas, focussing particularly on Jaisingh II, who sought to 'regulate newly arising *bhakti* movements' in his kingdom (p. 36). Of particular relevance to this study of Baladeva are three issues that Jaisingh II forced his religious subjects to address. To assert their legitimacy, he wanted these traditions to demonstrate their affiliation with one of the four established Vaiṣṇava schools, and to demonstrate the authenticity of their teachings, to produce Vedāntic treatises. A third issue was of particular importance to the Gauḍīyas: the marital status of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Baladeva's *Govinda-bhāṣya* is often seen in the light of the first of these two issues—and indeed the bulk of this book is concerned with these—but as argued in the book's final pages, Baladeva also addressed the third issue.

Issues of affiliation are complex, as demonstrated in Chapter Two ('The genealogy of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas'). Okita argues that a distinction needs to be made between a 'formal affiliation' and a 'theological affiliation' (p. 41). The former is based on claims of initiation (*dīkṣā*) into a particular lineage, whereas the latter is based on the acceptance of theological instructions (*śikṣā*). Okita shows that the two have not always coalesced in the early modern period, and indeed that these affiliations can change when it is 'considered advantageous to affiliate oneself with an alternative tradition, which is perceived to be more established than one's own' (p. 42), as he demonstrates with respects to the Daśanāmī orders and the Rāmānāndīs. This 'politics of genealogy' (p. 42) plays itself out in the Gauḍīya tradition too, where in the century prior to Baladeva, it was claimed that Caitanya had a 'formal affiliation' with the Mādhvas (p. 50), though all the sources about his life indicate that he was clearly not affiliated with that school theologically.

In writing the *Govinda-bhāṣya*, Baladeva is not establishing a new theology, but he draws on earlier thinkers to establish a theology that had already been articulated by his Gauḍīya predecessors, not in commentaries on Vedānta texts, but in treatises on Purāṇic, and particularly *Bhāgavata*, theology, like Jīva Gosvāmī's *Bhāgavata-sandarbhāṣas*. Chapter three ('*Bhāgavata* Theologies in Comparison') therefore examines the theology of Jīva Gosvāmī, one of the tradition's first theologians, through a close reading of his commentary on *Bhāgavata* 2.9.32–35, four verses that are considered to be the *Bhāgavata*'s 'original revelation' (p. 64). Okita compares Jīva's exegesis with that of Madhva and his commentator Vijayadvaja Tirtha, as well as Śrīdhara Svāmī, and demonstrates that, though there are parallels between the theology of Jīva and Madhva—particularly in their shared opposition to absolute non-dualism—Jīva's thought is theologically as well as exegetically 'independent' (p. 124), and is much more indebted to Śrīdhara than it is to the Dvaita commentators.

Having thus outlined the theological and historical background of Baladeva, Okita then turns to Baladeva's own thought in the fourth and final chapter ('Baladeva's *Govindabhāṣya*'), which comprises just over half of the book. This chapter consists of a close reading of Baladeva's commentary on key passages of the *Brahma-sūtras* on the nature of Brahman, on matter (*prakṛti*), on the living being (*jīva*), and on God's potencies (*śakti*) and his divine consort, Śrī. Though Baladeva claims to explain the *sūtras* 'in accordance with the doctrine of the sage Madhva' (cited p. 126), Okita demonstrates that exegetically he indeed often follows Madhva, but theologically he is profoundly influenced by Rāmānuja, and teaches a theology that is clearly drawn from Jīva. Indeed, Okita argues, the *Govinda-bhāṣya* is 'an attempt to translate Jīva's *Bhāgavata* theology into a full-fledged Vedāntic discourse' (p. 185), building not on the *Bhāgavata* commentator Śrīdhara (as Jīva does), but on the Vedāntic theologian Madhva. (One might thus be tempted to say Śrīdhara : Jīva :: Madhva : Baladeva.) This is particularly well illustrated in Baladeva's discussion on *Brahma-sūtras* 3.3.39–42, which, following Madhva, Baladeva claims is about God's consort, Śrī (pp. 220–33). Madhva's influence is here particularly pronounced, but the theology that Baladeva articulates is distinctly Gauḍīya: Śrī is God's essential potency (*svarūpa-śakti*), and Rādhā is her fullest embodiment. To explain the relationship between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā Baladeva employs the Mādhva concept of 'differentiating capacity' (*viśeṣa*)—masterfully analysed in the final section of the book (pp. 234–53)—to stress that they are non-different. In this final section, Okita's philological acumen and theological sensitivity complement each other as he shows how Madhva's notion of 'differentiating capacity' (*viśeṣa*) and Rāmānuja's concept of 'inseparability' (*apṛthak-siddhi*) demonstrate the same concern, but are used uniquely by Baladeva and Jīva respectively to explain the Gauḍīya notion of 'paradoxical oneness and difference' (*acintya-bhedābheda*) in different but parallel ways. Baladeva's use of the Mādhva concept of *viśeṣa* to establish the oneness of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, Okita argues, thus allows him to simultaneously demonstrate an affiliation with the Mādhva tradition and justify the extramarital relationship of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

These arguments are all rigorously grounded in specific passages of the *Govinda-bhāṣya*, which Okita carefully selects and patiently analyses. This is undoubtedly the book's strength, but at times some broader or general reflections would have been helpful. In chapter three, for example, it is argued that Jīva is not particularly influenced by Madhva, which is true for the sections of Jīva's writings that are examined here, though Jīva does build on Madhva more extensively elsewhere. A broader analysis of Madhva's place in Gauḍīya theology prior to Baladeva would have helped to clarify what exactly is unique to Baladeva. Similarly, there is little reflection on what Baladeva is doing more generally, as a commentator and theologian, or what his approach tells us about 18th-century Vedānta more broadly—insights which the astute reader is able to deduce from the textual analysis, but which would have been very helpful if made explicit.

Hindu Theology frames Baladeva's theology in the political context of 18th-century Jaipur, and argues that Baladeva 'made a formal connection with the Mādhva tradition for the sake of social, political, and economical advantages' (p. 44). Upon reaching the end of this book, this seems an oversimplification. Aligning themselves with the Mādhva tradition evidently had very real political, economic, and social consequences for the Gauḍīyas, but one wonders whether, as Baladeva was working out the theological implications of this Mādhva-Gauḍīya affiliation—which chapter two demonstrates had already been established prior to Baladeva—the impetus for writing the *Govinda-bhāṣya* might not also have been personal and autobiographical, as an attempt to harmonise the distinct phases of his own intellectual formation.

I also wonder whether the distinction between formal and theological affiliations—appealing as this is—really offers the best framework to discuss Baladeva's use of Madhva. Okita argues that Baladeva's use of Madhva is 'formal but not theological' (p. 258), which makes some sense in the way the *Govinda-bhāṣya* is analysed here, but it seems a difficult distinction to make—when is Baladeva's use of a Mādhva idea not theological? Part of what makes the *Govinda-bhāṣya* so remarkable is precisely that it blurs the boundaries between these two traditions, while being thoroughly grounded in that of Caitanya.

This book is an extremely lucid and rewarding study of an enigmatic author who is rarely read with such depth and precision. It should be of interest to anyone wishing to understand the theological background of the 'politics of genealogy' that were at play in 18th-century Jaipur, and the innovative eclecticism of Vedānta theology on the eve of colonialism.

Rembert Lutjeharms
Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies

doi:10.1093/jhs/hiw006
Advance Access Publication 22 April 2016

***The Ethics of Śaṅkara and Śāntideva: A Selfless Response to an Illusory World.* By Warren Lee Todd. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. ISBN: 978-1-4094-6681-9. pp. 201. £60 (hardbound).**

Despite differences in their 'revisionary metaphysics' and their position at opposite ends of the spectrum regarding the existence of an eternal substantial self, Todd demonstrates that Śaṅkara and Śāntideva have much in common with respect to morality and philosophical methodology. Todd focuses on points of convergence between Hindu and Buddhist thought rather than on the *ātman/ anātman* distinction, which is typically viewed as divisive. He argues that understanding the