who flourished after that date who did indeed present new material, in Nyāya and Vedānta. Kroll similarly demonstrates that seventeenth-century indigenous legal theorists were able to use ostensibly conflicting notions of inheritance of two twelfth-century legal theorists, Vijñāneśvara and Jīmūtavāhana, in order to work out an improved legal code. Vajpeyi looks at the rise of serious brahmanical scholarship on the character of the *śūdra*, examining several texts of the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries. These texts, in turn, shed light on the nature of grief and the debates involving social position and the authority of brahmans in the Upaniṣads. Kinra departs from the preceding papers by looking at Indo-Persian literature and scholarship, particularly lexicography, from the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries, in order to determine how these texts employed categories that were used in other discursive areas and how this also prepared Persian and Urdu speakers to play a role in the British empire.

These uniformly excellent essays demonstrate the diversity of Pollock's strategies for the practice of Indic scholarship. The bar, we can say, has been decisively raised. Indology can no longer be decontextualized or treated as ahistorical. Nevertheless, one thing is curiously missing from this very high-level volume: a response by Sheldon Pollock himself. Perhaps his students and peers speak for him well in a volume that should confer on him considerable pride.

Frederick M. Smith
*University of Iowa*
Frederick-smith@uiowa.edu

*Global Icons: Apertures to the Popular*. By Bishnupriya Ghosh. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011. xiii, 383 pp. $94.95 (cloth); $25.95 (paper).
doi:10.1017/S0021911812001647

In *Global Icons: Apertures to the Popular*, Bishnupriya Ghosh investigates the ways in which iconic images come to represent global aspirations. Ghosh sees icons as important sites of mediated communication and contestation, and rightfully wants icons to be a field of inquiry within her discipline of media studies. In making this case, she attempts to renew and reinvigorate a materialist theory of the icon informed by feminist theory. She understands an icon to be a "sensation provoking art object that ever enfolds the subject into its form" (p. 8). Icons, she tells us, because of their repetitive circulation, serve to link individual subjects to global social networks with shared aspirations. But these aspirations are plural, and icons "cannot represent only one aspiration" (p. 256). Ghosh focuses upon the controversies and contests that surround the ways in which different publics appropriate icons to represent their own aspirations.

She applies her perspective to interpret the "bio-icons" of Mother Teresa, Phoolan Devi, and Arundhati Roy—the iconic "saint," "outlaw," and "activist." These women have become iconic "star images," where particular visual

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911812001647 Published online by Cambridge University Press

representations have been circulated by media institutions, resulting in "publicity," "standardization," "repetition," and "condensation" that collectively serve to frame an image and establish a set of meanings within this frame. Claiming that "narrating the icon becomes combat in the social world, a struggle over one's location in the social through icon consumption" (p. 213), Ghosh focuses her analysis on the "war of signs" that surrounds these women. A strength of the book is the wealth of documentary and ethnographic data upon which Ghosh develops her analysis. These contesting narratives are lenses through which Ghosh identifies the different publics, and the aspirations of these publics, in a world increasingly shaped by global institutions and forces.

Ghosh draws upon two distinct understandings of the "popular" in order to identify and analyze the tensions inherent in the bio-icons she studies. On the one hand, she sees the popular as synonymous with "the people" constituted and unified through symbolic signification, usually for the benefit of hegemonic forces (pp. 20–21). On the other hand, Ghosh draws upon subaltern studies, but emphasizes visual culture as a prominent site of subaltern resistance. When disparate social groups consume iconic images, they read them from their own circumstances. Ghosh also emphasizes the icon's epistemology and ontology. Epistemology allows Ghosh to inquire into the framing of icons, which transforms them into easily recognizable signs. She refers to the symbolic "density" to highlight the multiple meanings codified within the sign. A focus on ontology allows Ghosh to interpret the ways in which iconic images motivate particular sensory and affective feelings that help to link the viewer to a larger public with common aspirations.

In the case of Mother Teresa, Ghosh emphasizes the struggle between the Vatican and the city of Kolkata to have the icon represent two different global aspirations. The Vatican wants Mother Teresa to signify the universal model of "charity," while the city of Kolkata wants her to represent the local civic community as a cosmopolitan space open to all. Ghosh traces this tension as it developed through the canonization process, especially with regard to the miracle necessary for the beatification process to occur. Beatification "re-territorializes" her into a European domain, as the face of a compassionate Roman Catholic Church. This "official" recognition of her sainthood de-territorialized her saintliness, which was well established and recognized in Kolkata (pp. 121–31).

The struggle between the Vatican and the municipality is also present in the logistics of her funeral. The concern with the deceased body of Mother Teresa is significant for Ghosh because of her concern with embodiment. The body of Phoolan Devi, after her death, is similarly a site of controversy. Ghosh analyzes in detail the struggle over who will control Devi's deceased body, her financial assets, and her legacy. This conflict is compounded by the caste and political dynamics that shaped Devi's life and rise to prominence as "a spokesperson for 'minorities' in the Indian democracy" (p. 132). With all of the fights that took place over Devi's body and assets, Ghosh asserts, "She seemed not to belong to any single kinship structure or caste affiliation" (p. 134).

After the acclaim she received for her first novel, the Booker Prize-winning *The God of Small Things*, Arundhati Roy turned her attention to social and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911812001647 Published online by Cambridge University Press

environmental causes, most prominently the campaign to stop the construction of the Narmada Dam. Roy's international celebrity gave her access to a global audience, and she "could be depended on to render a complex and unfamiliar local struggle in the global South intelligible to transnational publics through her actions and speech acts" (p. 113). In doing this, she became the "face" of the Narmada Bachao Andolan, displacing the established leaders of a movement with a lengthy history.

The book will be of interest to scholars interested in media and cultural studies, and those interested in the ways in which iconic images become means for social groups to assert their aspirations.

Daniel A. Jasper
*Moravian College*
djasper@moravian.edu

*Portraiture in Early India: Between Transience and Eternity.* By Vincent Lefèvre. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011. xix, 219 pp. $135.00 (cloth).
doi:10.1017/S0021911812001659

Portraiture, like personhood, is a contested category. Vincent Lefèvre selects a variety of examples from early South and Southeast Asia of what portraits in those traditions might be. "This book does not pretend at being a 'history of portraiture in early India' but rather a conceptual reflection on the role of portraiture in Indian art" (p. 18). As a meditation on theory and visual evidence, it is an excellent provocation, placing emphasis on "function" rather than "likeness": "portraiture is something one has to be entitled to" (pp. 13–15). His "Introduction: Portraiture, a Problematic Issue" asserts that "portraiture has been so successful during the Mughal and posterior periods because there was already an old tradition and that some of the characteristics may have continued to live sometimes up to the present" (p. 22) without, however, touching on complex issues of how "Mughal portraiture" functioned.[1]

"Verisimilitude" may be a better category—truthfulness to function—rather than "mimesis" (representation or imitation of the real world). "Donor" figures attending on images of saints and deities in many periods are a "type," recognizable in form but not identifiable, taking on the "style" of a "real" (Europeanized) "person" (i.e., more particular musculature, hair, and facial expressions) late in the colonial period.[2] Given the discursive and ruminative nature of Lefèvre's text, the index's lack of concepts like "mimesis" and "semantic" is a drawback.

[1]Yael Rice, "The Emperor's Eye and the Painter's Brush: The Rise of the Mughal Court Artist, c. 1546–1627," PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2012.

[2]John E. Cort, *Framing the Jina: Narratives of Icons and Idols in Jain History* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911812001647 Published online by Cambridge University Press