

Madhva's unknown sources : a review

Autor(en): **Rao, Shrisha / Sharma, B.N.K.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **57 (2003)**

Heft 1

PDF erstellt am: **08.08.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147598>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

MADHVA'S UNKNOWN SOURCES: A REVIEW

Shrisha Rao, Mount Mercy College

B. N. K. Sharma¹

1. Introduction

The present paper attempts to give an academic response to Roque Mesquita's study, *Madhva's Unknown Literary Sources: Some Observations*.² Reviews of the original German version of the above-mentioned text have appeared in various academic journals (some are briefly cited on the book jacket itself). Although well-intentioned in their assessments, they miss serious problems in the text reviewed, which we would like to point out here.

Upon an investigation of Madhva's unknown sources, Mesquita concludes that Madhva himself is the author of them, and that "we should assume that all the unknown sources of Madhva are not 'finished products', but merely 'work-titles', which Madhva employs as a loop (*sic*) to hang up his literary compositions" (p. 175). Madhva commits the fraud in honesty, for he "is sincerely and firmly convinced that he was acting on the command of Viṣṇu" (p. 176). Mesquita has a detailed discussion (pp. 35-62) of the *avatāra* doctrine of Madhva, and indicates how Madhva's claim of being the third incarnation of Vāyu, a god he describes as close to Viṣṇu, is pertinent in this regard (pp. 63-87).

Mesquita's monograph upon the subject of Madhva's unknown sources is a welcome foray into the subject, just touched upon by previous authors like Suzanne Siauve (*Doctrine de Madhva*, Pondicherry, 1968), and B.N.K. Sharma (*History of the Dvaita School of Vedanta*, 3d. ed., Motilal Banarsidass, 2000). It however makes factual errors of a type not generally expected in mature scholarship, and is thus suspect in its core assessments.

The chief difficulty with Mesquita's work is that his research is monumentally incomplete, so he presents a distorted picture that does little to

1 Corresponding author.

2 Mesquita, Roque: *Madhva's Unknown Literary Sources: Some Observations*. Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2000. 197 pp. (Translation of *Madhva und seine unbekanntes literarischen Quellen*). Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, Volume XXIV. Wien: University of Vienna, Institute of Indology: 1997; 151 pp.

cause faith in his conclusions. Mesquita is genuinely unfamiliar with the spread of the Vedic corpora, and in a rush to judgement labels Madhva the author of rare Vedic (and some post-Vedic) sources for which we have collateral evidence other than Madhva's own word; in fact, in a few cases, we even have evidence of their present-day or recent availability. This evidence for the existence of many of Madhva's sources that Mesquita carelessly labels "fictitious" is damaging to his credibility, to say the least, since it is always a given that a conclusion is no more sound than the facts upon which it rests.

It is well beyond the scope of the present paper to discuss the question of the unknown sources in full detail, but here we simply highlight evidences for a few of the "fictitious" sources (with an emphasis on the *Śruti* sources, which are thoroughly researched), and also point out other errors in the claims Mesquita presents as facts. We intend the following solely as a template for further thorough research, rather than as an exhaustive resource in itself.³

One improvement in the English version over the original German text is the availability of indices, so that names, "fictitious" titles, etc., may be readily cross-referenced with the pertinent pages in the book. Taking this into account, we do not necessarily cite every instance where an unknown source is discussed by Mesquita.

2. Some "fictitious" sources

Mesquita (pp. 30-31) cites with apparent approval the list of unfamiliar sources from Madhva's BSBh. objected to by Appayyadīkṣita (17th cent.), and proceeds to assume without verification that all of them, as well as others like them, must indeed be unknown. This amounts to putting too much faith in a medieval traditionalist's claims, a rather odd thing for a modern scholar to do. Mesquita also is apparently unaware of the reply to Appayyadīkṣita by his Mādhva contemporaries Vijayīndra Tīrtha⁴ and Nārāyaṇācārya⁵, whom he completely fails even to mention. The work of Vijayīndra has been published.⁶

3 The following, which has appeared since the original writing of this paper, may also be of interest: Sharma, B. N. K., *My Latest Four Research Papers*, available online from <http://www.dvaita.net/pdf/papers/four.pdf>. This booklet contains leads for further research, including the showing that some strange source names: *Māyāvaibhava Saṃhitā*, *Hayagrīva Saṃhitā*, etc., used by Madhva, are titles of available Pancarātra texts or fragments.

4 Cf. B. N. K. Sharma, *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta*, 3rd ed., 2000, pp. 403-404.

Here are some “fictitious” sources of Madhva, and independent evidences of their reality—

2.1 *Paṅgi-Śruti*

In footnote 49 on page 39, and elsewhere, Mesquita calls a *Śruti* text of Madhva with the label Paṅgi unknown, following Appayadīkṣita. In fact:

1. In the *Kāśikā* commentary⁷ (pp. 192-193) on Pāṇinī's Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.3.105, we find the statement *kalpeṣu paṅgī kalpaḥ*, showing that this was an important recension with its own Kalpa-sūtra. Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya on 4.2.66 also refers to the same, and indicates that said Kalpa-sūtra was actually available to him: *evamapi paṅgīkalpaḥ atrāpi prāpnoti*.
2. A manuscript of a Paṅgāyani Brāhmaṇa is reported by Oppert⁸ (p. 22, no. 390) to have been in the possession of one Venkatarāma Śrauti of Mullandram. Also see pages 454, 557, and 582, where Oppert notes other manuscripts. Therefore, in all, Oppert reports a total of four manuscripts, although there do not seem to be more recent reports of them (a matter unfortunately not helped by the fact that Oppert's catalog does not give any accurate contact information on his informants).
3. Paṅgi Gṛhya (further evidence of a robust recension) is quoted by the following⁹ (pp. 187, et seq.) traditional commentators—Haradatta on Āpastambha Gṛhya 8.21.9, Māskarī on Gautama Dharmasūtra 14.6.17; the Paṅgi Dharmasūtra is quoted in the *Smṛticandrikā* (Aśaucakhaṇḍa).
4. Paṅgi is counted as one of the *Śākhās* of the Ṛg Veda by the Prapancahṛdaya¹⁰, a pre-Rāmānuja text, in its second chapter (Veda Prakaraṇa).

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 437-438.

6 *Madhvamatamukhabhūṣaṇa*, Gurusārvabhauma Saṃskṛta Vidyāpīṭha, Mantralayam, 1994.

7 *Kāśikā*—(A Commentary on Pāṇinī's Aṣṭādhyāyī) of Vāmana and Jayāditya with Nyāsa (or *Kāśikā Vivaraṇapañjikā*) of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamanjari of Haradatta Mishra with Bhāvabodhinī—A Hindi exposition by Dr. Jaya Shankar Lal Tripathi, Vol.5 (Adhyayas 4.2–5.1), Tara Book Agency, Varanasi, 1988.

8 Gustav Oppert: *Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of South India*, Vol. 2. Govt. Press, Madras: 1885.

9 Datta, Bhagavad and Satya Shrava: *Vaidik Vāṇmaya kā Itihās*, vol. I. Pranava Prakashan, Delhi: 1978.

10 Ganapatiśāstrī, T; 1915; Prapancahṛdaya; Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, vol. 45; Trivandrum. Reprinted in 1987 by Yudhishtira Mimamsaka (Ramalal Kapoor Trust, Bahalagarh, district Sonapat).

5. Teachers of the Paiṅgi clan are quoted in numerous pre-Madhva texts, e.g., Śhaṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa 16.9; Patanjali's Sāmavedīya Nidānasūtra 4.7; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 6.3.16 (Madhuka Paiṅgya is mentioned).
6. The Paiṅgāyani Brāhmaṇa is twice quoted in the Āpastambha Śrauta-sūtra (at 5.14.18 and 5.29.4).¹¹
7. There are literally dozens of citations from Paiṅgi, Paiṅgāyani, and Paiṅgala Brāhmaṇas which have been collected by Satya Shrava, pp. 45-48¹², and by Ghosh.¹³ For brevity, we do not list them all here.
8. A Paiṅgi-Śruti (having an Upaniṣadic flavor) is quoted by Sudarshana Sūrī (a disciple of Rāmānuja) in his Śrutapradīpikā, as well as in the Śrutaparakāśikā in the *catuhsūtrī* portions. These are the same as that quoted by Śaṅkarācārya in his own commentary¹⁴ on the Brahma Sūtras, but SS quotes a few more words. Thus, early authors from the other two Vedantic streams also cite this source.

2.2 Bhāllaveya-Śruti

In footnote 17 on page 21, and elsewhere, Mesquita calls a *Śruti* text of Madhva with the label Bhāllaveya unknown, also following Appayyadīkṣita. In fact:

1. As before, in the *Kāśikā* commentary¹⁵ on Pāṇinī's Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.3.105, we find the statement *brāhmaṇeṣu tāvat—bhāllavinaḥ*, referring to a Brāhmaṇa text of this recension. The commentary Nyāsa shows that the recension was named after its progenitor Bhallu.
2. According to Ramanatha Dikshitar¹⁶, manuscripts of the Bhāllavi Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma Veda are still said to exist in North India (p. 207). These need to be traced and published.
3. The Bhāllaveya-Śruti is also quoted by Śaṅkara in his BSBh. (3.3.26) and by his disciple Sureśvara in his Bṛhadvārtika (2.4.26).
4. Satya Shrava¹⁷ (pp. 66-68) shows that the following pre-Madhva sources all reference the Bhāllaveyas: Venkaṭamādhava (commentator on several texts

11 Makoto Fushimi: "Brāhmaṇa passages in Āpastambha-Śrautasūtra." In: *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* (EJVS) 4-1 (1998), p. 11.

12 Satya Shrava: *A Comprehensive History of Vedic Literature—Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka Works*. Pranava Prakashan, Delhi: 1977.

13 Batakriṣṇa Ghosh: *Collection of the Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas*, 1935; reprinted as *Panini Vaidika Granthamala 9*. Distributors, Meharchand Lachhmandas, New Delhi: 1982.

14 *The Catuh-Sūtrī Bhāṣya of Madhvācārya*. B.N.K. Sharma, Madras: 1934.

15 See footnote 7 above.

16 M. Ramanatha Dikshitar: *Sāmasārasarwaswam*. Ramayana Printing Works, Madras: 1972.

of the Ṛg Veda); Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya on 4.2.66 and 4.3.105 (from this context it is clear that a recension of the SV is implied); Nāradaśikṣā 1.13; Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa 3.125; Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 2.4.7; Upagranthasūtra 1.10 of Kātyāyana; Bhāṣikāsūtra 3.15 of Kātyāyana; Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa 2.2.4.

5. Ghosh¹⁸ gives citations (pp. 110-111) of “this well-known school of the Sāmaveda” from the following: Bṛhaddevatā 5.21-23 and 5.159, Drāhyāyaṇa-śrauta-sūtra 3.4.2, Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra 1.2.11-12—and also indicates other places where citations may be found.

2.3 Sauparṇa-Śruti

In Madhva's Viṣṇu-Tattva-Vinirṇaya, one finds a quote labeled *iti sauparṇa-śrutiḥ*. This is, Mesquita thinks, a “loop” for one of Madhva's own productions. However, a clue about the origin of this *Śruti* is to be found in another of Madhva's own works, the Gītā-Tātparya-Nirṇaya 2.25, whence he references a quote with the label, *iti ṛgvede sauparṇaśākhāyām*. Accordingly:

1. In the Kashmir *Khila Samhitā*, the Suparṇa Adhyāya comprises the whole of Adhyāya 1 of 11 *sūktas* (79 mantras in all). However, a manuscript of the Suparṇa Adhyāya having an extent of 214 *ślokas* (i.e., 214 x 32 syllables) exists in the collection of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal¹⁹ (p. 240, entry 172).
2. In addition, there is one more Suparṇa Adhyāya²⁰ translated into English.
3. In her work on the *khila* texts of the Ṛg Veda, Bhise²¹ discusses some Sauparṇa hymns, and translates them as well.

Our sources indicate that many manuscripts of the Sauparṇa recension of the Ṛg Veda still exist in India; these need to be collated and published.

17 See footnote 12 above.

18 See footnote 13 above.

19 Mahāmahopādhyāya Hariprasād Shastri: *A Descriptive Catalog of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. II—Vedic Manuscripts; Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta: 1923.

20 Dange, Sadashiv A.: *Divine Hymns and Ancient Thought Ritual and the Quest for Truth*. Navrang, New Delhi: 1995 (vol. II, pp. 292-301).

21 *The Khila-Sūktas of the Ṛgveda: A Study*. Usha R. Bhise, BORI, Poona: 1995. Bhandarkar Oriental Series #27.

2.4 *Vatsa-Śruti*

This is a source objected to as fictitious by Appayyadīkṣita, and following him, by Mesquita also. In fact:

1. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa²², the recensions of various Vedas is discussed, and a *guru-śiṣya paramparā* is described from Paila, one of the direct disciples of Vyāsa. There (verse 3.4.22), each of the following five disciples of Devamitra Śākalya are mentioned as having received a Samhitā each of the RV from their Guru: Mudgala, Galava, Vatsa, Śāliya, Śiśira. These all correspond to Vedic recensions only: a Śiśira *śākhā* is known, as are the RV *Kramapāṭha* of Bābhavya Galava, and the Mudgala Upaniṣad. This is strong collateral evidence for the onetime existence of the Vatsa *śākhā* also (remnants may still remain).
2. The Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali²³ at 4.2.104 reads *Gārgakam | Vātsakam | Maudakam | Paippalādakam | Kālāpakam*, etc.—the other names on the list are of Vedic recensions: Mauda and Paippalāda of AV, Kālāpaka the same as Maitrāyaṇī, Gārga of SV—so must ‘Vatsa’ also be.
3. All the versions of the ancient text Caraṇavyūha clearly state²⁴ that Vatsa (also called Pauṇḍravatsa) was a school of the Vājasaneyī Yajur Veda.
4. Hemādri (13th cent.) has quoted the Vatsa Gr̥hya²⁵. Once more, the existence of a Gr̥hya is strong evidence for the recension.
5. The Vedavrkṣa²⁶ mentions a YV *śākhā* named Pauṇḍravatsa.

2.5 *Other “fictitious” titles*

For brevity, we mention just in passing some of the other “fictitious” titles used by Madhva:

2.5.1 *Uddālaka-Śruti*

Uddālaka the son of Aruṇi belonged to the Gautama clan²⁷ (pp. 187-188), for which reason he is also called Āruṇi. The Prapancahr̥daya mentions Gautama as

22 See footnote 9 above.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 165.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 213.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 165.

26 Witzel, Michael: *Materialien zu den vedischen Schulen (I. Ueber die Caraka-Sakha)*. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, vol. 8/9; 1982/3; pp. 171-240.

27 See footnote 9 above.

a *sākhā* of the RV (and also of the SV); an “Uddālaka-Śruti” could come from either source. (Madhva also cites a Gautama-*khila* in his Gītā Bhāṣya, 10.41.)

2.5.2 *Indradyumna-Śruti*

This is related to the Bhāllaveyas, or could even be part of them. For instance, note the following passage from the Kāṇva Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa:²⁸

2.7.1.16 In that matter, Indradyumna Bhāllaveya made [use of] an *anuṣṭubh* [verse] as prayer of invitation and a *triṣṭubh* [verse] as the offering prayer, thinking, “Let me thus enclose on both sides (or let me obtain from both).” He fell down from this chariot. Having fallen from the chariot, he broke (dislocated) his arm.

Mention of an Indradyumna Bhāllaveya may also be found elsewhere, e.g., in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 5.14.1.

2.5.3 *Agniveśya-Śruti* and *Kauṇḍinya-Śruti*

Agniveśya and Kauṇḍinya, the progenitors of the recensions bearing their names, are said to have been disciples of Vadhula, which is a full-fledged *sākhā* now found in Kerala. The Ananda Samhitā—a Vaikhānasa text, clearly mentions the Kalpas of these two *sākhās*. The Tantravārttika of Kumarila Bhatta (1.3.11) also mentions the Kauṇḍinya Kalpa. The Pravaramanjari of Puruṣottama also quotes the Kauṇḍinya Śrautasūtra²⁹ (pp. 237-238).

At this time, the remnants of the Agniveśyas may be found in the Tanjore region among the Dikshitar Śaivites. They use the Taittirīya YV, and their tradition might now be extinct.³⁰

2.5.4 *Pippalāda-Śākhā*

An Atharva Veda recension bearing the name is well known (and has been published); it, or associated Brāhmaṇa and such literature, could easily qualify for the name.

The Pippalāda school is also alluded to by the Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali at 4.2.104 (cited previously) and 4.2.66.

28 Swaminathan, C. R. Kāṇvaśatapathabrāhmaṇam, vol. II. Indira Gandhi National Center for Arts, New Delhi: 1997. Comprises Kāṇḍa II and III of the text.

29 See footnote 9 above.

30 M. Witzel, personal communication.

2.5.5 *Vyāsa-Smṛti*

This is not, as Mesquita appears to assume, simply a loose tag applied to a mixture of some proportion of Purāṇic sources as well as Madhva's own secret compositions, but is an independent *dharmasūtra* treatise in its own name. It is quoted from by Śaṅkara under Gaudapāda-Kārikā 2.31, as well as by others in many other places. The editors of the Dharmakośa series out of Pune (vol. 1, 1937) state that they have tried to reconstruct this and other rare Smṛtis from quotations found in various works. P.V. Kane³¹ discusses this source also.

We have heard that the complete Vyāsa-Smṛti is part of a collection of Smṛti texts published from Calcutta, but do not have an exact reference.

2.5.6 *Bhaviṣyatparva*

This is a name given to the last part of the Hari-vaṃsa; Mesquita (pp. 62, fn. 103) adduces no reasons whatsoever for saying that it has “nothing to do” with that text. (The mere assertion that a quote is not found there is not sufficient—see section 3.) Names at a second level (names for parts of texts) such as Mokṣadharmā are used by Madhva. The name can also refer to the last *Parva* of the Mahābhārata itself—see the opening remarks of Rāghavendra³² (p. 1) in his Gītā-Vivṛti, where he names the eighteen *Parvas* of the Mbh., using this name for the last.

2.5.7 *Mahāsaṃhitā*

This is a Pancarātra work also known as the Sanatkumāra Saṃhitā. It is divided into five major sections each called a Rātra. It has been published.³³ Unfortunately, all manuscripts the editors could find were mutilated, so the final *Rātra* called Bṛhaspati-Rātra is missing, as are significant parts of others as well. The colophon, which uses the name Mahā Saṃhitā, states that the text contains of the order of 10,000 verses (11,000 according to one manuscript) while the published text has of the order of 6000 verses, the rest being lost.

31 Pandurang Vaman Kane: *History of Dharmasūtra (Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law)*, Vol. 1. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona: 1930.

32 Rāghavendrayatikṛtaḥ Gītārthasaṅgrahaḥ (Gītāvivṛtiḥ). Editors A. R. Panchamukhi, Raja S. Pavamanacharya. Gurusārvabhauma Saṅskṛtavidyāpīṭha, Rāghavendra Swāmī Maṭha, Mantrālaya: 1995.

33 *Sanatkumāra Saṃhitā of the Pancarātrāgama*. Ed. Pandit V. Krishnamāchārya (Foreword by Dr. V. Raghavan). The Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras: 1969.

2.5.8 *Lakṣaṇaśāstra*

An unknown text called a *lakṣaṇa-śāstra* by Madhva is found quoted in his MBTN, chapter nine. The fragment from which the verse is quoted is found in two manuscripts, and has been published; its editor surmises that it may be from the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*.³⁴

3. “Fictitious” quotes from known works

Mesquita notes that he is unable to find quotes given by Madhva from certain well-known sources, and assumes that this is because Madhva has claimed that his quotes come from them in order to impart legitimacy. However, we show by a few examples that no such assumption is called for.

Briefly, we may note that published versions and manuscripts of these known sources vary widely, and there is generally no *editio cum notis variorum* for one to use.

3.1 *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*

This is a source quoted from by Madhva quite a number of times, and always, apparently, with the problem that his quotes are not to be found (Mesquita, p. 90, fn. 153). After a study of the major *Purāṇas*, Banerji³⁵ says (p. 25):

None of the many verses from the *Brahmāṇḍa* quoted by Hemādri (13th cent.) in his *Caturvarga-Cintāmaṇi* occurs in the extant *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. This naturally raises the suspicion that the present *Purāṇa* is, to a great extent, different from the genuine *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. The contents of the extant *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* [also] do not accord well with what is stated [about them] in the *Matsya Purāṇa*.

3.2 *Garuḍa Purāṇa*

This is another source of Madhva that has a similar problem. Even here, Banerji says we have the same difficulty:³⁶

34 Mahābhāratatātparyanirṇayaḥ: Śri Vādirājatīrthaśrīpādapraṇītayā Bhāvaprakaśikākhyavyākhyayā sametaḥ, ed. V. Prabhanjanacarya, Sri Vyasa Madhwa Seva Pratisthana: supported by Prof. B. Venkateshacharya Memorial Trust, Bangalore: 1998.

35 Sures Chandra Banerji: *Studies in the Mahāpurāṇas*. Punthi Pustak, Calcutta: 1991.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 30.

The contents of the extant Garuḍa do not tally with those mentioned in the Matsya, Skanda, and Agni [Purāṇas]. Not a single one of the many verses attributed to the Garuḍa by early writers like Madhvācārya, Devanabhaṭṭa, Hemādri, Mādhvācārya, Śūlapāṇi, etc., is found in the present version. These reasons warrant the assumption that there was an earlier version of the Garuḍa.

Similar problems exist with other Purāṇas also—refer Banerji. Mesquita uses just one published version of each text he refers to, which would cause problems even in other cases than Madhva's quotes, because the published texts do vary significantly from one another.

3.3 *Mahā Upaniṣad*

This is an extant Upaniṣad quoted from by Madhva (and also Rāmānuja in his BSBh. on 1.1.1), but none of the quotes said by Madhva to have come from this source are to be found there. In this regard, the editors of the Dharmakośa series³⁷ opine (p. 4), based on their reading of the work itself, that the text presently known as Mahā Upaniṣad “is collected from the original Mahā Upaniṣad, and the [present] text is a quotation from the latter.”

4. Arguing for the Authorship of Madhva

Most of the arguments Mesquita offers for the authorship of Madhva are predicated upon the incorrect assumption that there indeed is no trace of the sources except Madhva's own word. Given the evidence we have cited for the veracity of these sources, his arguments have no basis and may be summarily discarded. However, just for illustration, we mention a few specific errors in Mesquita's analysis.

The claim of Madhva that certain texts called Tattva-viveka, etc., were authored by Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa comes from the Vaiṣṇava doctrine that all of the traditional Pancarātra texts were authored by Nārāyaṇa:

*pañcarātrasya kṛtsnasya vaktā (vettā) nārāyaṇaḥ (tu bhagavān) svayam*³⁸

37 *Dharmakośa, Upaniṣatkāṇḍa*, vol. 2, part 2, Pune: 1949.

38 Mbh. 12.337.63, also quoted by Madhva in the second chapter of his Mahābhārata-Tātparya-Nirṇaya.

Whether there were, or are, Pancarātric texts named Tattva-nirṇaya, etc., and indeed whether any modern scholar would glibly accept the claim that the entire genre of such texts was authored by Nārāyaṇa are issues to be discussed, of course, but Mesquita is nonetheless in error for not having raised them, and for having mis-stated Madhva's position.

Mesquita claims (pp. 93 et seq.) that Madhva's commentator Jayatīrtha refers to the unknown source "Brahma Tarka" as a "lost work," vide his statement *atītena prabandhena uktam*. However, the phrase *atīta prabandha* need not necessarily mean "lost text." It simply means "previous text," where the "previous" is anterior in the flow of discussion, rather than in time. Such usage on the part of Jayatīrtha³⁹ is seen in his commentary on Madhva's commentary on the Īśāvāsya Upaniṣad, verse 15, where he says *iti atītagranthena uktam* in reference to verse 6 of that Upaniṣad itself. Madhva gives the extent of the Brahma Tarka as 5000 verses, etc., in verses 74, et seq., of his Anu-Vyākhyāna, in commenting upon which not only does Jayatīrtha *not* state that a "lost" text is being referred to, but argues for why the Brahma Tarka only, rather than the traditional Nyāya and other texts, must be accepted by all Vedāntins.

5. Madhva's Critics and Non-Critics

Mesquita is very wrong in his impression that Madhva was criticized for his unknown sources right from his own time. Even if we accept his suggestion that Varadaguru and Venkaṭanātha were of Madhva's own time,⁴⁰ the fact remains that neither scholar has referenced Madhva, his doctrine, his works, or his statements. A random or undirected diatribe about people who use unknown sources cannot be correlated with Madhva except by a stretch of Mesquita's ill-founded imagination. The fact remains that the first opponent to clearly accuse Madhva was Appayyadīkṣita, who came three centuries later, and it is also highly significant that Appayya *offers his criticisms on his own, with no reference to previous views*. It is also significant that no follower of Madhva upto the time of Vijayīndra Tīrtha felt the need to respond to the charge, as surely would have been done had it been known before then. It is not plausible

39 See the publication of the Īśāvāsya with commentaries that is available online from <http://www.dvaita.net> (ISBN 0-9703421-2-8).

40 We do not in fact accept this, noting that Mesquita confounds the 17th-century Venkaṭanātha, who was a critic of Madhva, with the 13th-century Vedānta Deśika, who was not. This issue and related ones are discussed at length elsewhere; see footnote 3 above.

that such a charge made would have been ignored, since Jayatīrtha and others were quick to consider and explain other charges against Madhva.

These issues have already been discussed by Sharma⁴¹ *in extenso* under the rubrics ‘Problem of Sources’ (pp. 87-89) and ‘Problem of Untraceable Texts’ (pp. 437-438). Although this material must have been easily available to him, Mesquita remains unaware, as Sharma notes (p. 632).

As new evidence, we should note that Vyāsarāya (1460-1539), who initiated the polemical battle between Dvaita and Advaita with his Nyāyāmṛta, quotes some of Madhva’s supposedly “fictitious” sources as authorities in his favor, and his opponent Madhusūdana Saraswatī, who did not even refrain from name-calling during the course of his defense of Advaita, makes no charge of unknown sources, but instead strives to explain the authorities in his own side’s favor.

For instance, Vyāsarāya quotes a line attributed to the Brahma-Tarka in the Viṣṇu-tattva-vinirṇaya, in the first *pariccheda*, under the topic *pratyakṣasya jātyā upakramādinyāyaiśca prābalyam*.⁴² Note particularly the following:

prābalyamāgamasyaiva jātyā teṣu triṣu smṛtam" iti tu vaidikārthaviṣayam |

In response, the Advaitasiddhi says:⁴³

tadagrhitagrāhitvamapi na prābalye prayojakam [...]

—and specifically concludes with:

pratyuta āgamasyaiva sarvataḥ prābalyam smāryate
—“*prābalyamāgamasyaiva jātyā teṣu triṣu smṛtam" iti |*
na ca tad `vaidikārthaviṣayam' iti vācyam,
advaitasyāpi vaidikārthaviṣayatvāt ||

Similarly, the Nyāyāmṛta quotes a verse attributed to the Parama-Śruti in the Viṣṇu-tattva-vinirṇaya:⁴⁴

41 B.N.K. Sharma; see footnote 4.

42 Number 20, page 276, Volume 1, Nyāyāmṛta-Advaitasiddhi with commentaries. Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation, Bangalore: 1994.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 279.

44 DVSRF edition, Vol. 2, Number 33, page 490.

*ahamityeva yo vedyah sa jīva iti kīrtitaḥ |
sa duḥkhī sa sukhī caiva sa pūtraṃ bandhamokṣayoḥ ||
iti śrutau mokṣānvayokteśca |*

The Advaitasiddhi response is seen to accept the validity of the quote offered.⁴⁵

As such, the conclusions are that the question of unknown sources never figured in the Nyāyāmṛta-Advaitasiddhi debate, the *locus classicus* for the criticism—and defense—of Madhva, and that criticism of his sources was not uniformly made from his time on, unlike the impression conveyed by Mesquita.

6. Conclusion

The bogey of unknown and untraceable quotations was raised against Madhva by disgruntled critics like Appayyadīkṣita for the first time centuries after Madhva, and was of only a nuisance value. Appayyadīkṣita never contested the Nyāyāmṛta or Candrikā composed near his own time, though he survived the demise of their author Vyāsātīrtha by a good 40 years or more. He thought it wise to leave it to better men like the far-off Madhusūdana Sarasvatī who never bothered to raise the issue, possibly because they were better informed.

It was in sheer frustration that Appayya turned to target Madhva himself somehow and found the topic of the alleged *aprasiddha* texts a convenient weapon with which to discomfit and malign the system on minor issues like the untraceable texts; or Madhva's alleged departures from Paninian grammar, language, and idiom; or his alleged metrical lapses and so forth. The attempts had only a nuisance value but even these irrelevant criticisms were repulsed then and there by doughty scholars of Dvaita like Vijayīndra and Nārāyaṇācārya.

Madhva's disciple Akṣobhya debated with Vidyāraṇya on *tattvamasi* in a *vāda* umpired by the great Vedānta Deśika and was declared the victor. As a result, Madhva's system was given a place in the Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha, which could not have been done if Madhva's system had only a cart-load of untraceable texts to show in support.

In the present paper, we have tried to gather pertinent information about texts alleged to be creations of Madhva's own fancy. In the absence (in some cases incidental rather than necessary) of access to the actual texts themselves, such circumstantial evidence as we have tried to present here serves the purpose; even in law, circumstantial evidence is acceptable when direct witnesses are not

45 *Ibid.*, p. 498.

available. Mesquita, and anyone who cares to agree with his analysis, would be doing a far better job by investigating matters for himself as we have done, rather than by blindly agreeing with Appayya and coming up with ludicrous theories based on false premises.

Acknowledgements

Robert Zydenbos drew our attention to Mesquita's work, and also to the need for a well-researched academic response. Gerald Penn helped us begin our work by his partial translation of the German text. A great deal of information regarding Vedic sources was given by Vishal Agarwal; some information on other sources was also provided by Krishna Kadiri and Kesava Tadipatri. Proofing of earlier drafts was undertaken by Arvind Acharya, Kesava Tadipatri, Nataraj B. V., and Krishna Kadiri.