

As for the several fields of production, Mr. Moreland examines them in detail. His three chapters on agricultural and non-agricultural production, with the final chapter on the wealth of India, are probably those which will have most interest for the economist as such. Others dealing with the social and political system will doubtless prove more attractive to readers who have not specialized on a subject which demands close attention to be intelligible. But the economic is so closely interwoven with the social and the political that these chapters are as necessary to the economist as to the general reader. The whole book will repay close study, and should also be of interest to anyone who, without being prepared to give it close study, still desires to have in his mind an effective and vigorous picture of India three hundred years ago, before the European had become an influence there.

A. D. INNES.

---

AN OUTLINE OF THE RELIGIOUS LITERATURE OF INDIA. By J. N. FARQUHAR, M.A., D.Litt. Oxon. 8vo; pp. xxviii, 451. Oxford University Press, 1920.

One of the most surprising experiences of the Great War was that many things which we had previously thought to be makeable only in Germany could be manufactured as well, if not better, in Great Britain. It is so likewise with the present volume. The immense mass of research and compilation on which it is based and the orderly method in which these materials are digested recall the best type of German *Handbücher*, while the clearness of style with which the author conveys his knowledge is a home-bred virtue. The task would have been heavy enough if it had been limited to literature of a strictly religious tenour; but Dr. Farquhar has generously (and justly) extended it so as to include in his purview a large number of writings which are only secondarily associated with religion, and thus has produced a work which embraces in its survey a very great part—perhaps even the greater part—of the whole literature of India, and is a most useful and reliable storehouse of ordered knowledge.

The method followed by Dr. Farquhar is best described in his own words: "I have attempted," he says (pp. xi-xii), "to divide the milleniums [*sic*] covered by the growth of the literature into periods corresponding as nearly as possible to the great waves of change in belief and practice, and within each period to group the books as far as possible, according to the religion, the sect, and the sub-sect to which they

severally belong." Though this plan has some disadvantages it is on the whole the best that could be devised. As M. Barth remarks, even in India the centuries have their own physiognomies. Moreover, the narrative is supplemented by an excellent bibliography, in which the writings recorded are arranged by their schools and also, as far as possible, in accordance with their date.

Considering the immense amount of polyglot reading which has gone to make up the book, mistakes are singularly few. Misprints are comparatively rare.<sup>1</sup> Even in matters of opinion there are few cases where the author lays himself open to criticism. Perhaps in his account of the Upanishads (p. 52) he hardly makes enough allowance for the evolution of the idea of the *ātman* through the preliminary stages of *pratīkas*, and rather suggests that it arose suddenly, *per saltum*. Possibly, too, it is rather too much to say that "we can be sure" that the Sāṅkhya is derived from the Upanishads (p. 61). On p. 159 the author mentions some writings of the Prajñā-pāramitā class as products of the Madhyamaka<sup>2</sup> school, whereas on p. 115 he notes some other works of the same order without reference to the Madhyamakas. On p. 207 he asserts that Buddhism came into Tibet about A.D. 640, which contradicts his announcement on p. 213 that "Buddhism was introduced into Tibet in 747". The statement that the Upamiti-bhava-prapañcha is in Prakrit (p. 215) is erroneous; the book is in Sanskrit.

The opening sentences of chapter vi (p. 220) are, perhaps, more likely to open ground for controversy than any others in the book. Dr. Farquhar here declares that "the sects which ruled the development

<sup>1</sup> A considerable proportion of *lapsus calami* occurs in Tamil names, of which the transcription is inconsistent and not seldom inexact: *inter alia* we may mention the incorrect spellings "Tevārām" and "Devārām" instead of "Tēvāram" or "Dēvāram" (p. 256), and "Kāñchi-Appar" for "Kachchiy-Appar" (ib.). Of other minor slips, apart from the irregularities in the transliteration of Tamil words, we may note the following specimens: "Vāsudeva" for "Vasudeva" (p. 100); "dyaṇuka" for "dvyāṇuka" (p. 133); "Vasubandha" for "Vasubandhu" (p. 156); "Aparamitāyus" for "Aparimitāyus" (p. 158); "Khumbh" for "Kumbh" (p. 174); "Udyotakara" for "Uddyotakara" (p. 180); "Vācakar" for "-vāchakar" (p. 220); "samuchchhaya" for "samuchchaya" (pp. 243, 250, 437); "Akshobya" for "Akshobhya" (p. 273); "Kuṇḍakuṇḍa" for "Kundakoṇḍa" or "Kundakunda" (p. 281); "Raṇṇa" for "Ranna" (p. 283); "Puraṁdar Dās" and "Śrī Vyāsa Rāja" for "Puraṁdara Dāsa" (the genuine Kanarese vocalization) and "Vyāsa-rāya" (p. 303); "Veṅkāya Ārya" for "Veṅkayārya" (p. 304); "Satsandarbha" for "Shaṭ-sandarbha" (p. 309); "Padmāvali" for "Padyāvali" (p. 376). On p. 310 the symbols of equality are oddly misapplied twice instead of hyphens, so that we have "Mathurā= māhātmya" and "Rās= līlā"!

<sup>2</sup> We take the opportunity to point out to Dr. Farquhar that the correct form of this word is either *Madhyamaka* or *Mādhyamika*.

of Hinduism during these centuries [A.D. 900–1350] received their inspiration in large measure from the enthusiastic bhakti of the wandering singers of the Tamil country. . . . Much of the peculiar fervour and attractive power of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* comes from the devotion of the Ālvārs”. This may be true; but to us it seems rather a case of *atiprasaṅga*. How much influence the Tamil votaries exerted on the rest of India cannot be definitely estimated; but it does not seem to have been much. They were chiefly interested in the worship of Viṣṇu according to the cult of Srirangam or Tirupati or other typical establishments, and they were little concerned with the myths of Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa; and it was precisely the latter which formed the staple spiritual food of the *bhakti* that was such a notable feature in the religious life of this period. This Kṛṣṇa-cult—very different from the Viṣṇu-cult of the South—found its classic expression in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, and Dr. Farquhar accordingly suggests, apparently with some confidence, that the *Bhāgavata* was composed in the Tamil land. For this there is really no evidence at all, except a vague statement in the *Bhāgavatamāhātmya* that Bhakti was “born” in the Dravidian country, which means merely that in the latter regions there existed a warm emotional cult of some deity, perhaps Viṣṇu, in ancient times. The *Purāṇa* might have been written in Dravidian lands, as Dr. Farquhar says, “if in the Tamil-country there was a group of *Bhāgavata* ascetics who felt the same devotion [to Kṛṣṇa] as the Ālvārs [to Viṣṇu] and expressed it in similar fashion” (p. 233). There is much virtue in an “if”; for there is no evidence whatever that such a group existed in this period, and if they had existed they would probably have expressed their bhakti in Tamil verse, like the Ālvārs.

In our opinion Dr. Farquhar is right, as against Professor Keith (JRAS. 1920, p. 628), in denying the authorship of the *Bhāskara-bhāṣya* to Nimbārka (p. 239). He is, however, misleading when he states that the Vedantic standpoint of the Tamil Śaivas is Viśiṣṭādvaita (p. 255), for the latter term is more conveniently restricted to Śrī-vaishṇava theology; and he is incorrect in translating *rasāyana* as “sweets” (p. 303). But all these are but small blemishes in a work of abounding excellences, and we take leave of Dr. Farquhar with deep gratitude and admiration.

L. D. BARNETT.