

R. MESQUITA: *Madhva und seine unbekanntes literarischen Quellen. Einige Beobachtungen.* (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, XXIV.) 151 pp. Wien: Sammlung De Nobili, 1997. ÖS 400.

Madhva, also known as Ānandatīrtha, was the founder and expounder of the Dvaita system of Vedānta who flourished around the beginning of the thirteenth century. Characteristic of Madhva's works is the quotation of an impressive number of sources, most of which cannot be identified. These quotations are sometimes attributed to titles of unknown works or incorrectly to known works or appear without reference to any specific work. B. N. K. Sharma in his *History of the Dvaita school of Vedānta and its literature* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2nd rev. edn., 1981) lists 292 such works in his appendix I, pp. 567–70. Among the titles listed are works, such as the *Tantrabhāgavata* or *Brahmatarka*, works that were unknown even to Madhva's contemporaries and his own disciples. This general state of affairs has long puzzled scholars and led to the articulation of several theories.

Mesquita's work represents a first attempt at examining the authenticity of Madhva's citations by taking into consideration the literary and theological framework in which they appear. It is divided into four main chapters, which examine (1) Madhva and his critics, (2) the theological foundation of Madhva's *avatāra* claim, (3) Madhva as a writer of canonical works, authorized by Viṣṇu, and (4) redactorial and textual arguments for Madhva's authorship.

After detailed analyses, Mesquita arrives at the conclusion that the unknown sources cited by Madhva are neither old but lost works (as claimed by his followers) nor fabricated by Madhva to deceive others (as claimed by his opponents). Instead, they are passages written by Madhva following an impulse of Viṣṇu, and Madhva thus claims divine origin for them. Madhva attributes not only the passages which he composes himself, but also the titles of the works to which they are ascribed, directly to Viṣṇu. Mesquita claims that this is the case for at least three kinds of citations: those that appear only in Madhva's works and expound peculiarities of his system; those that Madhva attributes directly to Viṣṇu; and those that clearly quote or refer to other works authored by Madhva (p. 79). Madhva's claim to be an *avatāra* of Vāyu and a partial *avatāra* of Viṣṇu is offered as evidence that the unknown sources cited by him are not fabricated, but originate from Viṣṇu himself. Their function, Mesquita argues, is to support peculiar traits of Madhva's teachings.

This is a fascinating study, deserving of much attention, especially from scholars in India.

GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN