not only across London, Delhi, and Bengal but also between political parties and between senior officials and the police on the ground in these three sites. These running debates on whether or not to implement emergency laws indicate that inasmuch as the two went hand-in-hand, there were difficulties in justifying violence within a liberal discourse, a running tension between law and exception.

Though the book brings alive the empirical differences between center and state in responding to political violence, it could clarify better the relationship between Bengal and the rest of India in the revolutionary imagination and in the state's policing of terrorists. Much of the story takes place in Bengal and includes elements specific to the state: the colonial narrative of "effeminate Bengalis" and revolutionary denial of this stereotype, and differences between provincial and central emergency legislation, to name a couple. Ghosh mentions that revolutionary memoirs fit the Bengal movement into the longer trajectory of nation-formation and that colonial texts fit Bengali politics into a broader story of pan-Indian violence, but the cultural and political relationship between region and nation, state and center, is not consistently elaborated.

This reservation notwithstanding, *Gentlemanly Terrorists* is a fascinating read and necessary for historians and political scientists studying state violence, nationalism, political subject formation, and historical imagining in modern South Asia, as well as in the broader postcolonial world. The book concludes by briefly tracing the legacy of colonial emergency legislation in postcolonial India, from as early as the 1950s and continuing until today, a telling comment on the functioning of postcolonial state power.

Radha Kumar
Syracuse University
rkuma100@syr.edu

Hindu Law: A New History of Dharmaśāstra. Edited by Patrick Olivelle and Donald R. Davis Jr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. xviii, 551 pp. ISBN: 9780198702603 (cloth).
doi:10.1017/S0021911819002195

Hindu Law: A New History of Dharmaśāstra is a new collection of essays in the Oxford History of Hinduism series. Edited by Patrick Olivelle and Donald R. Davis, Jr., two distinguished scholars in the field, the book contains a thorough exploration of Sanskrit Dharmaśāstra texts—formal, scholastic discourses on *dharma*, which is sometimes translated as law, but which is famously more complex than that.

The book is divided into four sections. The first, on the history of the genre, contains two articles that cover the two main poles of the book's exploration: the foundational texts of the tradition and the later corpus of commentaries and digests written with reference to those foundational texts. The second section, the longest by far, contains articles on an array of topics treated in Dharmaśāstra, which include everything from rites of passage to laws of inheritance to duties pertaining specifically to women. The third section, regrettably the shortest, explores influences between Dharmaśāstra and other disciplines. There are two articles in this section, one by Davis on the reception of Dharmaśāstra up to and including the colonial period, and the other by Gregory Schopen exploring the possibility that the Buddhist codes of monastic law were the source of certain elements of Dharmaśāstra. The final section includes a series of articles with theoretical

or interpretive projects, focusing on such things as emotions, material culture, animals, and subjectivity.

In the book's introduction, Davis explains that the editors of the volume tried to pay special attention to the "historical contexts, conflicts, and developments" (p. 2) that mark the intellectual history of Dharmaśāstra. This is carried out fairly consistently, and one of the volume's great strengths is that the authors are aware of Dharmaśāstra not just as an isolated intellectual artifact, but as the product of communities struggling in history. This allows them to read Dharmaśāstra dialectically—to see it not just as a static expression of power but as the attempt to create or bolster power under particular conditions, and with varying degrees of success. It also allows them to keep in view those whom Dharmaśāstra systematically excludes from this project of power, such as women and those who are now called Dalits. Olivelle, for example, opines that Manu's treatment of kingship is in part intended to deny legitimacy to powerful Kushana rulers (p. 24). And Mikael Aktor argues that Dharmaśāstra's treatment of class and caste is an attempt to restrict upward social mobility in the face of a great increase in wealth held by lower castes, concluding that "a certain Brahmin frailty already lay behind the opulent self-promotion that we read in large parts of the Dharmaśāstra texts" (p. 76).

One lingering and important question that the authors in this volume do not have a collective or conclusive answer to is what exactly Dharmaśāstra was supposed to be in the first place. The title suggests that it was the science of law in a modern, political sense, exercised from a "Hindu" standpoint, whatever that may mean. And this does seem to describe much of what Dharmaśāstra discusses. But as the editors and authors are aware, this is not the full story. First of all, it is unclear whether, where, and to what extent Dharmaśāstra texts were ever actually the basis for real, enforced laws (p. 3). Ludo Rocher, for example, asserts plausibly that "[t]he commentators on ancient *smṛtis* and authors of *nibandhas* were not jurists writing books to be used in courts of law; they were engaged in a scholastic exercise…" (p. 177). On the other hand, Dharmaśāstra texts contain injunctions covering such things as which direction a Brahmin should face when eating or voiding excrement, and giving instructions for farming that, in the words of Adam Bowles, may or may not be "simply offering advice on good agricultural practice" (p. 249).

So if they are not quite books of law in any straightforward sense, what are they? A few answers are offered in the book, each of which is compelling, none of which is final. Dharmaśāstra is variously called an "intellectual project or … an elite ideology" (p. 3); a "scholastic exercise" intended to prove that "all *smṛti* rules were part of a single, encompassing revelation" (p. 177); and a "new theology … asserting the centrality of the [Brahmin] *gṛhastha* (married householder)" (p. 17). Christian Novetzke gives the most detailed and nuanced answer to this question when he writes that Dharmaśāstra is "a field of Indian social science, rather than a set of laws or legal text…," encompassing "the general consideration of social order" and "ideas about human organization in relation to soteriological concepts and goals" (p. 480). Later, Novetzke calls it a "normative social science" (p. 487). Also worth considering is Aktor's definition of ritual, which could, as Davis seems to recognize (pp. 6–8), potentially be applied to a great deal of what Dharmaśāstra describes: "framed, stereotypical, repetitive (therefore, imitable) public and irrevocable acts" (p. 433).

The volume is not exhaustive. One thing missing, quite unfortunately, is a treatment of the influence of Dharmaśāstra on contemporary Indian politics and society. Davis tells us in the introduction: "The possibility that some traditional ideas of Dharmaśāstra continue to lurk beneath the surface of new expressions of Hindu identity, doctrine, and practice remains probable" (p. 10). But given the number of people killed in India in the past two to three years alone over accusations of beef eating or intercaste marriage,

this is surely an understatement. Davis does treat the reception and transformation of Dharmaśāstra during the colonial period, and includes a brief section on Dharmaśāstra post-independence (pp. 380–82), as well as a brief description of vows (*vrata*) in contemporary Hinduism (pp. 332–34). Still, it would have been interesting and important to see an entire article or two discussing the role of Dharmaśāstra in the highly religio-politically charged India of the twenty-first century.

Nevertheless, these gaps aside, this is a thorough, erudite, well-organized, and informative volume that will surely be useful to any Indologist looking to expand their knowledge of Dharmaśāstra.

James Reich
Pace University
jreich@pace.edu

The Political Philosophy of Muhammad Iqbal: Islam and Nationalism in Late Colonial India. By Iqbal Singh Sevea. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. xix, 234 pp. ISBN: 9781316633700 (paper).
doi:10.1017/S0021911819002201

The memory of few figures in South Asian history has been so indelibly molded in the crucible of postcolonial nationalist historiographies as that of the twentieth-century Indian Muslim poet and philosopher Muhammad Iqbal (d. 1938). Heralded by some as the intellectual inspiration and architect of Pakistan, presented as a devout Indian patriot by others, and understood as a modernist pan-Islamist by yet others, Iqbal's legacy is as varied as it is contested. Iqbal Sevea's *The Political Philosophy of Muhammad Iqbal: Islam and Nationalism in Late Colonial India* disrupts neat narratives about Muhammad Iqbal's politico-theological thought while also offering important correctives and insights on Muslim intellectual critiques of the modern state during the interwar period. At the heart of Sevea's book is the seemingly obvious yet hugely important and often sidelined argument that the question of what constitutes "Muslim politics" is never a static and settled matter, thus rendering conceptually unsound and untenable liberal and liberally mobilized categories like "political Islam." Iqbal's career and thought, Sevea argues, showcase a Muslim political theorist who thoroughly complicated any canonized or predetermined notions of Islam and politics.

As a prime example of the salient conceptual and historiographic interventions that sustain the thrust of this book, Sevea seeks to interrupt the tendency in extant scholarship and popular perceptions about Iqbal to divide his life and thought into what Sevea calls "spurious breaks" (p. 30). More specifically, Sevea shows that reading Iqbal in evolutionary terms as having transformed from an "Indian nationalist" to a "Pan-Islamic separatist" does profound injustice to the complexity of his political thought and project. Central to Iqbal's political philosophy, Sevea convincingly demonstrates, was an abiding critique and mistrust of the modern state as the locus of politics. Approaching Islamicate categories like *milla* (community) or *qawm* (nation) in Iqbal's thought as equivalent to a territorially bound state represents an act of mistranslation that does not take into account the details or nuances of Iqbal's reformulation of such concepts as nation and nationhood. Through a close and rather brilliant reading of a range of Iqbal's writings, including poetry and prose, Sevea shows that Iqbal "relocated" the idea of the nation squarely in the domain of