

RICHARD FOX YOUNG: *Resistant Hinduism: Sanskrit sources on anti-Christian apologetics in early nineteenth-century India*. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, Vol. VIII.) 200 pp., 2 plates. Vienna: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1981.

The core of this book is a study of the *Mataparikṣā*, a Christian work in Sanskrit by John Muir (1810–82, author of *Original Sanskrit texts*), and three replies to it by Hindu paṇḍits. The *Mataparikṣā* was printed, in three versions, in 1839, 1840, and 1852–4; of the replies, the first exists only in manuscript, the second was printed, and the third was issued in manuscript but was printed in 1951. The author shows good reasons for identifying the first paṇḍit with Subāji Bāpu, the jyotiṣa scholar who worked with Lancelot Wilkinson; the second is unknown but lived in Calcutta, which may explain why he was the only one to have his work printed. The third, Nilakaṇṭha Goreh, is well known by the name Nehemiah, under which he was baptized four years after writing his attack on Christianity.

Muir's book was a notable attempt to present Christianity to the Sanskrit-reading public, using Sanskrit terminology but largely Paleyan arguments. The three replies are rooted in the Sanskrit tradition, particularly in Advaita Vedānta; but, as the author shows, the Hindu disputants were able to answer Christians with arguments that had already been developed for use against Jains, Buddhists and materialists, or against various āstika views. When faced with accusations of immoral behaviour on the part of Kṛṣṇa, they could draw their arguments from Śrīdharasvāmin; against the doctrine that each soul is created by God, they could argue, as Śaṅkara did (*Vedānta Sūtra* 1, 1, 34), that a beginningless series of rebirths is a uniquely satisfying solution to the problem of theodicy. Where the view to be refuted was less familiar, the paṇḍits were less successful. Two of them discussed, in very general terms, the value of Paleyan evidence for the divinity of Jesus, but none attempted detailed criticism; nor did any of them appreciate Muir's historical-linguistic argument against the eternity of the Veda.

The author places each side of the controversy in historical perspective, discussing earlier attempts to express Christianity in Sanskrit, and earlier Christian-Hindu controversies of which reports, though not the original texts, exist. He points out that there was almost certainly no historical link between the *Mataparikṣā* and these earlier controversies, rightly ascribing the similarities to the frame of reference which the participants had in common. He discusses the participants' biographies, including the contrary shifts of Muir to religious liberalism and of Goreh to Anglo-Catholicism.

The texts are quoted extensively in translation, with the original in footnotes; this part of the book is very valuable, though the

syntax is sometimes misconstructed. I would translate *asmiṃś calanto manujāḥ prakāśam aiśyā dayāyāḥ paramaṃ vilokya / nistārakaṃ svīyam udāram iṣṭam bhaktyādriyante dr̥ḥayā kṛtajñāḥ* (Muir) as 'Men who walk in it see the supreme manifestation of the divine mercy, and gratefully reverence their exalted beloved saviour with steadfast devotion', not 'Men who walk in it and belong to God, being grateful for having seen mercy's supreme manifestation, reverence their saviour and their beloved salvation with steadfast devotion' (p. 61); *martyair na so 'rjitāḥ svargaḥ svakiyāiḥ puṇyakarmabhiḥ* (Muir) as 'Heaven is not earned by men through their own good deeds', not '... by men whose deeds are meritorious' (p. 63); *kāryāsāmānyahetor apy āryaiḥ kāryatvam iśyate* (Nilakaṇṭha) as 'The specific cause of an effect must, according to the Āryans, be itself an effect', not 'Those who are wise regard being an effect as due to the specific cause of the effect' (p. 112).

This is a welcome book, but it does not always succeed in placing ideas in their historical context. For instance, there is some needless puzzling over why the Hindu disputants did not say much about Jesus as a human character. Rammohun Roy and Keshub Chunder Sen did so because they were in touch with Unitarian and liberal thought which took Jesus's humanity as the starting-point of Christology; but Hindus confronted with a tract presenting Jesus as a divine saviour, using his historicity only as Paleyan evidence for his divinity, naturally responded to this Jesus and to no other. Again, though the author points out the differences in American, British and Continental uses of the word 'evangelical', and variations in its meaning at different periods, he leaves the reader to guess what he means by it subsequently, and tends to decide who is or is not an evangelical by criteria which may not be applicable to the period in question. He does indeed give evidence of Muir's deviation from Evangelicalism, especially in his later life; but he is surely wrong to see such evidence in the fact that Muir equated reason with Christianity, or saw Hinduism's resistance to Christianity as intellectual rather than 'immorally [*sic*, for morally?] based'; no less an Evangelical than Charles Grant said 'The Hindus err because they are ignorant'. On the Hindu side, he oversimplifies when he says 'the paṇḍits derived their ideas of God, man, the universe, and salvation from the Vedas', and makes an elementary slip in speaking of '*pratiloma* marriages between ... a *ksatriya* father and *sūdra* mother'.

There are many errors in English vocabulary and spelling. A tendency to use high-sounding words leads the author to use 'hermeneutics' to refer to the choice of Sanskrit as a medium for missionary work, and to the choice of particular Sanskrit words to translate Christian terms—a task which raises hermeneutic problems but is not itself hermeneutics. The same tendency leads him to write not 'See bibliography' but 'Perusal of the bibliography will acquaint the reader with a number of publications ...'.

D. H. KILLINGLEY