

REJOINDER: MADHVA'S UNKNOWN SOURCES

Roque Mesquita, University of Vienna

My monograph on *Madhva's Unknown Sources*, originally published in German (1997) and since 2000 also available in English,¹ has met with a very favourable reception. The many letters of appreciation I have received, and the six book-reviews which have appeared to date in different Indological Journals praise the work as being a fascinating study, seriously and carefully carried out and as one which is completely convincing.² The review of Sharma published in the present issue of this journal, however, does not belong to that category. Not only is the tone of its language different from that of the other six reviews, the way he evaluates the study deviates sharply. Sharma denounces the monograph without hesitation as monumentally incomplete, and as containing several factual errors. He also criticizes the previous favourable reviews of my monograph, claiming 'they miss serious problems in the text reviewed' [cf. 1].

The reason why Sharma passes this adverse judgement on my book is his selective and biased reading of the methodological reasoning advanced therein from different angles. As a matter of fact, Sharma's critical remarks deal primarily with the first chapter of my monograph: "Madhva and his Critics" [cf. 5]. The following chapters: "Theological Foundation of Avatāra-Claim" and "Madhva as a Viṣṇu empowered author of all Canonical Texts", are mentioned only in passing [cf. 1]. The subsequent chapter: "Redactional Criteria for the Authorship of Madhva" is not referred to at all (!), although this chapter along with the previous two form the core of my argumentation. For this reason, the assessment of Madhva's unknown sources—attempted by Sharma—[cf. 2-4] which does not examine their essential connection with the Avatāra-claim of

1 Roque Mesquita: *Madhva's Unknown Sources. Some Observations*. Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi: 2000 (Trans. of the original German monograph: *Madhva und seine unbekannten literarischen Quellen. Einige Beobachtungen*. [Publications of the De Nobili Research Library XXIV]. Wien: 1997).

2 See K.K. Raja (*Adyar Library Bulletin* 61 [1997: 261]); G. Bühnemann (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61/2 [1998: 408-409]); J.W. De Jong (*Indo-Iranian Journal* 42 [1999: 63-64]); Oskar von Hinüber (*Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 95/2 [2000: 206]); Jan E.M. Houben (*Asiatische Studien* 54/2 [2000: 463-468]); E. Franco (*Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies* 44 [2000: 236-237]).

Madhva and fails to take into consideration the redactional criteria for his authorship is not only superficial but extremely arbitrary. The overall impression is that Sharma avoids discussing the main issues in my monograph and is satisfied to deal with sideline subjects under the pretext that he does not want to discuss the issues in full detail, as I shall try to show below.

The main issue discussed by Sharma is the fictitious sources. This is the longest section in his review. He brings together materials collected by himself and by other scholars [cf. 7] on the old genuine texts quoted by Madhva as well as by other ancient authors. An unbiased scrutiny of this collection reveals that it is only independent evidence for the fact that these texts really existed. In no way can this collection prove that the quotes attributed by Madhva to these texts are also genuine unless Madhva's quotes can be identified in the works of other ancient authors. Not in a single case does Sharma produce a bit of evidence. Nor could he identify similar passages quoted by ancient authors in the works of Madhva. And the assumption that some manuscripts of old texts which are reported to be existent but are not available may provide evidence for the veracity of Madhva's quotations in the near future is nothing but guess work, or wishful thinking at best.³

In short: There is no collateral evidence whatsoever that the *text passages* attributed by Madhva to the ancient and lost texts are genuine. And the collateral evidence collected by Sharma is valid only for proving the existence of some *old text titles* mentioned by Madhva in connection with his quotations. Curiously, Sharma mixes up these facts.⁴ Consequently, his entire argumentation is based

3 As an illustration of this 'imaginary veracity' of the untraceable quotations "giving Madhva the benefit of the doubt, at this distance of time", as Sharma postulates in his latest publication (2001:7; 23), I can point out Vyāsaśmṛti, see below n. 36.

I take this opportunity to thank Prof. Sharma for sending me a complimentary copy of his recent pamphlet titled "My latest four Research Papers" (Mumbai 2001 [available also at <http://www.dvaita.net/pdf/papers/four.pdf>]), which reached me when I was about to complete this rejoinder. The first paper bears the title: "Brahmatarka and other unknown source Books of Madhva". Some issues raised again here have been already discussed in my rejoinder. In this pamphlet too Sharma conspicuously avoids addressing the key issues of my monograph. But he raises a set of new objections against my book which are based on misquotations and misinterpretations, and makes many arbitrary accusations phrased in an arrogant and rude tone, unusual in serious scholarly discourse. An unbiased reader will take note of it not without some embarrassment; see below n. 4; 15 and 42.

4 In (2001:12-15) too, Sharma makes a similar mess out of the old text titles belonging to Pañcarātrasaṃhitās, declaring triumphantly: "Prof. Mesquita's effort to condemn Madhva on both the fronts of B.T. and P.R. Saṃhitas has definitely misfired. He should now have

on *hetvābhāsa*, from which general conclusions are drawn [cf. 4]: “Given the evidence we have cited for the veracity of the sources [*sic!*], his [Mesquita’s] arguments have no basis and may be summarily discarded.”

It is therefore not surprising that Sharma fails to mention that Madhva also quotes from a large number of sources which were unknown not only to his predecessors but also to his contemporaries, and even to his own pupils—an observation made by other scholars too, such as Siauue.⁵ And all these sources, whether they bear well-known titles of old texts or completely unknown titles, have something in common, namely that they are *always* adduced as additional evidence for the original doctrine put forward by Madhva. I have discussed this matter not only in connection with the two genuine text titles Paṅgiśruti and Bhāllaveyaśruti,⁶ but also throughout the monograph, as well as in my latest publication on Madhva.⁷ Sharma’s following remark is therefore erroneous: “Mesquita calls a Śruti text of Madhva with the label Paṅgi [and Bhāllaveya] unknown, following Appayadīkṣita.” [cf. 2.1. and 2.2.]. Since no serious scholar denies that Madhva refers to some old text titles, one could say that the whole effort to collect material on old lost Vedic sources produced nothing more than *siddhasādhana*—evidence!

Taking all of these points into consideration, we can say that the *lacunae* in the quotations of Madhva are not confined to a few excerpts (these kind of *lacunae* are also to be found in the works of other Vedānta-commentators), and rather comprise a whole class of literary works with countless different titles.⁸ Sharma’s charge that I did not pay regard to Vijayīndra Tīrtha’s reply to Appayadīkṣita’s critic [cf. 2] can in no way invalidate my arguments, since what Vijayīndra has to say on the point is really irrelevant. The highlights of his statements are summarized by Sharma as follows: “[...] To all these charges, Vijayīndra has given crushing replies. He points out that (1) quotations from unknown and untraceable sources are not wanting in the Bhāṣyas of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Śrīkaṇṭha and that the charge against Madhva alone, savours of nothing but prejudice. The authors of *Kalpa Sūtras*, too have quoted from many

the grace to withdraw his sweeping charges against Madhva and apologise for rushing into print on delusive data.”

5 Quoted in Mesquita *op.cit.* n. 20 [= 1997 n. 13].

6 See *ibid.* n. 49, 133, 192, 223-225, 227, 266, 338, 340, 346 [= 1997 n. 41; 122; 182; 213-215; 217; 256; 327; 329; p.137 n. 333].

7 See R. Mesquita, *Madhva: Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya. Annotierte Übersetzung mit Studie*. [Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 28]. Vienna 2000.

8 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 21f. [= 1997:18].

non-extant sources”.⁹ As one can see, Vijayīndra Tīrtha could supply only three (!) such instances of unknown sources in the commentaries of Śaṅkara (Sū III 2,18: *mokṣaśāstreṣu* [...] *iti*), Rāmānuja (Sū I 1,26: *catuspadū ca gāyatrī kvacid drśyate / tadyathā* [...] *iti*) and Śrīkaṇṭha (no particulars about the quote are given), and no evidence at all is produced for the unknown sources in the Kalpa Sūtras! Actually, this “crushing reply” is but a very meagre and unconvincing criticism.

Regarding the two unknown sources, namely Bhaviṣyatparvan and Brahmatarka, from which Madhva quotes most frequently and which therefore can be considered as crucial texts among the fictitious sources, Sharma remarks, in reference to the first source, that I adduce “no reasons whatsoever for saying that it has ‘nothing to do’” with the last part of the Harivaṃśa, called Bhaviṣyatparvan [cf. 2.5.6]. Again, Sharma makes selective use of my argumentation and fails to acknowledge that I have argued in very clear terms in several places of my monograph that Bhaviṣyatparvan, apart from presenting almost all the particular doctrines of Madhva,¹⁰ is heralding his arrival as *aṃśāvatāra* of Viṣṇu and consequently implying a *vaticinium ex eventu*, that is, a prophecy after its fulfillment, which allows us to be fairly sure that Madhva himself is the author of this source.¹¹

Similarly, Sharma’s remark that the phrase *evam atītena prabandhenoktam*—used by Jayatīrtha in his commentary of Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya to introduce a quotation from Brahmatarka—need not necessarily mean a ‘lost text’, but simply means a ‘previous text’, where ‘previous’ is anterior in the flow of discussion, rather than in time [cf. 4], this remark makes no sense, since this is the very first place in Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya where Brahmatarka is quoted;¹² *atīta* necessarily means a lost text and not a previous text.

I refrain here from commenting in detail on other unwarranted statements made by Sharma in this connection. Nevertheless, I would like to examine one more point in this discussion. In my monograph, I refuted the attempts of C.R.K. Rao to prove the authenticity of Brahmatarka on the basis of one presumptive independent passage of the same by being able to show that it was actually

9 See Sharma: *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature, Volume II*. Bombay: 1961, p. 177f.

10 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 169ff. [= 1997:137ff.]

11 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 61f.; 69f.; 79; 162f. [= 1997: 48f.; 55f.; 63f.; 130f.]

12 See VTN (p. 17,1-18,11) (= VTNT [Madras 1969], p. 360,16). There are also two other quotes from this source at the end of VTN (p. 43,5-9 and 43,12-14).

Madhva's original quote!¹³ Now, Sharma thinks he can offer 'new evidence' for its authenticity and refers to the polemical discussion between the Dvaitin Vyāsarāya (1460-1539) and his opponent Madhusūdana Sarasvatī on the validity of Āgama as recorded in a fictitious quote attributed by Madhva to Brahmatarka in Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya. However, the discussion in this case is not focused on the quote as such but on the teaching, which is flatly rejected by Madhusūdana as non-Vedic. His own teaching, on the contrary, he says, is Vedic (*na ca tad vaidikārthaviṣayam iti vācyaṃ, advaitasyāpi vaidikārthaviṣayatvāt*). How can this polemic convey new evidence for the authenticity of Brahmatarka? And why should we admit that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī accepted the validity of the quote, as Sharma tries to insinuate?

It is somehow surprising that Sharma does not reason in this connection with regard to the arguments put forward by me to prove that Brahmatarka was a composition by Madhva; he is also completely silent on the three criteria I formulated for deciding that an unknown source goes back to Madhva.¹⁴ As a matter of fact, the first two criteria apply to Brahmatarka in as much as (1) it is quoted only by Madhva and deals with his particular teachings and (2) Madhva directly attributes the authorship of Brahmatarka to Viṣṇu.

As one can see, all the arguments which Sharma puts forward in defence of Brahmatarka as an ancient composition and thus not as Madhva's own work are not convincing at all. In his latest publication¹⁵ Sharma makes a new attempt in this regard, basing his findings on sheer misquotation of my monograph. Since readers may not be acquainted with his recent pamphlet, I am compelled to quote Sharma's statements in full: "Brahma Tarka is Prof. Mesquita's main target of attack on Madhva. He regards it as a bogus work authored by Madhva himself and passed off as an ancient authority. This sensational theory of his rests on most slippery foundations of a passing reference to B.T. in the concluding Mangalacarana verse of Madhva's *Upadhikhandana* (brahmatarkokti margatah) [*sic!*] that the treatment of the subject is in accordance with the teachings of B.T. Reading too much between the lines of the Mangalacarana verse, Prof. Mesquita has a brain wave that the entire body of the text of the Up. Kh. is a verbatim carbon copy of B.T., barring the Mangalacarana."

13 See Mesquita *op.cit.* n. 162 [= 1997 n. 151]. While discussing this matter again (2001:14-15), Sharma misrepresents my original statements.

14 See *ibid.* p. 89ff. [= 1997:71ff.].

15 Sharma (2001:9f.); see above n. 3.

In reality, nowhere in my monograph is such a statement about the Upadhikhandana to be found. So no wonder that Sharma could not provide the precise location for his quotation!

The fact is that I had underscored that Brahmatarka stands out clearly from all other unknown sources of Madhva not only because it is the most quoted source in his different texts, but also because it is the basis for two other works of his, namely Pramāṇalakṣaṇa and Vādalakṣaṇa, known also as Kathālakṣaṇa, as Madhva states in the colophons: *ānandatīrthamuninā brahmatarkoktimārgataḥ | māṇalakṣaṇam ity uktam; ānandatīrthamuninā brahmatarkānusārataḥ | kathālakṣaṇam ity uktam*.¹⁶ None of them polemicizes against the famous *dictum* of Vimuktātman in defence of Māyāvāda: *durghaṭatvam avidyayā bhūṣaṇam na tu dūṣaṇam*, whereas Upadhikhandana, also known as Māyāvādupādhidūṣaṇa, criticizes it, without, however, mentioning Brahmatarka as its basis. As we clearly see, Sharma mistook the identity of Upadhikhandana. He is completely unaware of the fact that Madhva attributes, in his Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya,¹⁷ the refutation of Vimuktātman's teaching explicitly to Brahmatarka: *drṣṭavastuno mithyātvāṅgikāre ca yuktyapekṣā | na tu satyatve –*

*drṣṭasya satyatāyām tu yuktir vāyuktir eva vā |
bhūṣaṇam tasya mithyātve yuktyabhāvo 'tidūṣaṇam |
yuktiś ca doṣa eva syād balavanmānavarjitā |
iti brahmatarke*

For this reason, the entire argumentation of Sharma in this connection belongs to the realm of imagination, such as when he argues: "Having arrived at the conclusion that Up.Kh. itself is an integral part of the B.T., emanating from it, Prof. Mesquita triumphantly declares that the B.T. 'polemizes upon istasiddhi'," or when he remarks: "Prof. Mesquita's ascription of B.T. to Madhva's own authorship hinges on the casual reference to B.T. in the concluding Mangala verse of Madhva's Up. Kh. and gives him a jumping ground [...] The Up. Khandana is an out and out dialectical work *cap a pie* demolishing the Advaita doctrine of Brahmājñānavāda from beginning to end [...] The B.T. *on the other hand* is a constructive treatise dealing with a wide range of subjects [...] The two works are not thus *in pari materia* and a dialectical work like the Up. Khandana cannot be treated as forming a part of the B.T. by any stretch of the imagination."

16 See Mesquita *op.cit.* n. 160 (= 1997 n. 149).

17 See Mesquita *op.cit.* n. 171-172 (=1997:160-161).

Thus, Sharma's new attempt to prove the veracity of Brahmatarka has gone completely wrong.

Sharma's objections [cf. 3] to my findings about Madhva's quotations attributed to the Purāṇas are also ill-founded, since his argumentation is based on wrong assumptions. My discussion of the Purāṇa texts is founded upon the presupposition that the textual variations as well as the textual extensions build the backbone of anonymous literature.¹⁸ As such, the Purāṇa literature supposes a manifold historical development, in which a single text takes shape slowly over centuries through the redactionary activities of several authors, so that one could theoretically assume that Madhva might have had knowledge of textual portions unknown to us. However, the untraceable Purāṇa quotations of Madhva have an intimate relation with his typical teachings, and their phrasing bears Madhva's mark. These facts do not allow for any other conclusion than that he himself composed the passages in question.

Extensive elaboration regarding this conclusion based on a large number of Madhva's quotations has been presented by me in the section of my book "Redactional Criteria for the Authorship of Madhva". Sharma completely ignored it in his review,¹⁹ while other reviewers took special notice of this

18 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 81; 139f.; 152ff. [= 1997:64; 112.; 122ff.].

19 Similarly, in his recent pamphlet (2001:27f.; see above n. 3) Sharma refrains from discussing the merits of the redactional criteria I worked out in order to prove the authorship of Madhva. However, he picks a single instance out of a set of cases I investigated for this purpose, in which the reality and the eternity of the universe (*prapañcasyānūdisatyatva*) is proved by Madhva on the basis of Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad I 17-18. As a matter of fact, the thesis of monism expressed in these verses is twisted by Madhva by replacing *jñāte* by *ajñāte* (I 18d: *upadeśād ayaṃ vādo jñāte dvaitaṃ na vidyate*), so that it means just the opposite. In support of this interpretation Madhva presents two fictitious quotations from Paramaśruti and Brahmatarka (see Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 104ff. [= 1997:83ff.]). The several arguments put forward by Sharma to justify the alteration of the original text cannot be scrutinized here. But the conclusion drawn by him is of special interest for our purpose: "It is therefore in keeping with these facts to read Jnate Dvaitam na vidyate with an elided "a" grammatically permissible *here*." Even granted that this is the case, it is surprising that Sharma shied away from mentioning that Madhva elsewhere comments on the same verse of Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad without making any change in the text and giving another interpretation. The deviant interpretation is also supported by an anonymous quotation (*iti ca*), as I noted in two different places of my monograph. Sharma is also completely silent on the two different explanations of Chāndogyopaniṣad (VI 9,4), the first based on the transmitted reading *tat tvam asi* and the second based on the altered reading *atat tvam asi*, which contradicts all existing traditions. The first explanation is supported by the fictitious Brahmatarka and the second by a fake quotation from Sāmasaṃhitā. (see Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 101; 108 n. 204; p. 117 [= 1997:81; 87 n. 194; p. 94]).

discussion on the characteristic feature of Madhva's sources, for instance Dr. Houben: "The case for the existence of a large number of *genuinely* old texts and passages which have all disappeared precisely when they are supportive of Madhva's peculiar doctrine has indeed become very weak with the present stage of research and esp. with Mesquita's work."²⁰

But there is also another weighty and convincing reason for the authorship of Madhva, namely his *avatāra*-claim. I have elaborated in detail how Madhva puts forward the peculiar teaching of his *avatāra*-claim by adapting existing thought patterns.²¹ Madhva is the third earthly incarnation of Vāyu, who is essentially connected with Viṣṇu as his *antaraṅga* (*ānandatīrthavarānāmavati tṛtīyā bhaumī tanur marutaḥ*). As the third incarnation of Vāyu, Madhva is allotted the task of imparting the knowledge (*jñānakārya*), and carries out this divine task in the name and on the command of Viṣṇu: *pūrṇaprajñas tṛtīyas tu bhagavatkāryasādhakaḥ*. This claim enables Madhva to justify that the unknown texts are not fabricated by him but inspired by Viṣṇu himself. Consequently, Viṣṇu is ultimately the author of the literary compositions of Madhva without Madhva ceasing to be their author. In order to underscore this fact he applies a literary device found in the Mahābhārata, in the Bhagavadgītā and in the Pañcarātrasaṃhitās²² in that he attributes directly to Viṣṇu not only his unknown sources but also his peculiar doctrinal tenets (*satsiddhāntaḥ* = *sarvanirṇayāḥ*) and even his logical argumentation to demonstrate them (*yuktayo nirṇayasyaiva svayam bhagavatoditāḥ*). I have provided a long list of such passages in my monograph.²³ In face of this clear exposition, Sharma's misleading remark [cf. 4] that I did not take into consideration the Vaiṣṇava doctrine that all Pañcarātra texts are authored by Nārāyaṇa is not quite acceptable. In fact, I have adduced to that purpose not only a single instance (MBh XII 337, 63), as Sharma does, but a number of other instances, such as MBh VI 63,5cd; ViṣP III 3,31cd; III 4,5; II 11,7ab; Gī XV 15cd; PadP I 1,44; Īśvarasaṃhitā I 53cd-54ab; Śaṅkara's Gītabhāṣya (*upodghāta*) and also similar teachings in the classical Sāṃkhya-Yoga texts, where Kapila is described as an incarnation of Īśvara or as Īśvara-mahaṛṣi or as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu.²⁴ It is incredible that Sharma overlooked all these details mentioned in my study. And this is not the only area where Sharma refuses to acknowledge the evidence supplied in the monograph! Throughout his

20 See above n. 2; see also Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 175f. [= 1997:142f.].

21 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 35ff. and p. 63ff. [= 1997:29ff. and 51ff.]; see also below n. 49.

22 See *ibid.* n. 56; 135; 142 and 269 [= 1997 n. 48; 124; 131 and 259].

23 See *ibid.* p. 81ff. [= 1997:65ff.].

24 See J. Bronkhorst: *The Two Sources of Indian Asceticism*. Delhi: 1998, p. 69f., quoted in Mesquita *op.cit.* n.11.

review Sharma carefully avoids referring to the *avatāra*-claim of Madhva when he discusses the problem of unknown sources, and also fails to recognize that Madhva's unknown quotations appear only when he puts forward his peculiar doctrine. Without consideration of these two sides of one and same coin, the assessment of Madhva's unknown sources is completely unconvincing!

Hence I find his statement that I do not accept the existence of some of Madhva's sources [cf. 1; 2 and 4] arbitrary, since I did clearly acknowledge that Madhva quotes from some old well-known texts having titles such as *Paingīśruti* and *Bhāllaveyaśruti*. As the text passages attributed to them by Madhva are supportive of the typical teaching of Madhva and therefore only traceable from Madhva onwards, I labelled these passages fictitious.²⁵ This means that these text passages were not transmitted from generation to generation and accepted by *śiṣṭas* before Madhva's time. The question of credibility implied here is to be solved with in the framework of *aṃśāvatāra*. From Madhva's own statements it is clear that he is sincerely convinced of his mission to proclaim all canonical works in the name of Viṣṇu in the *kali*-age by virtue of divine charisma (*viṣṇu-prasādū*). As outstanding evidence for this conviction let me quote a statement made by Madhva at the end of his commentary to the *Mahābhārata*:²⁶

ānandatīrthākhyamuniḥ supūrṇaprajñābhidho grantham imaṃ cakāra |
nārāyaṇenābhīhito badaryām tasyaiva śiṣyo jagadekabhartuḥ ||
*yas tatprasādād akhilāṃś ca vedān sapañcarātrān sarahasyasaṅgrahān |*²⁷
vedetihāsāṃś ca purāṇayuktān yathāvad anyā api sarvavidyāḥ |

The sage called Ānandatīrtha, [also] having the name Supūrṇaprajña, composed the present work in verse [...] and who (*yas*) composed also (*ca*) by the grace of Viṣṇu all the [eternal] Vedas and Itihāsas as [the fifth] Veda²⁸ together with Purāṇas and Pañcarātrasaṃhitās, summarizing the secret doctrines, as well as all other Vidyās in a very exact way.

25 See above n. 3; below 36; 38.

26 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 10f. and 63ff. [= 1997:51f.].

27 It is to be noted that there is a metrical lapse in the second quarter, which contains 12 syllables instead of 11! Such metrical and also grammatical irregularities were referred to by Appayadīkṣita. They are found in several fake verses ascribed by Madhva to well-known and also completely unknown text titles. Sharma [cf. 6] regards these irregularities as "minor issues" or "irrelevant criticisms" having "only a nuisance value". Details concerning these irregularities will be discussed in my forthcoming publication containing a collection of approximately 2,000 fictitious verses attributed by Madhva to both well-known and unknown Purāṇa titles.

28 Madhva restores the five eternal Vedas, as their original meaning was concealed in the Kaliyuga by the authors (*vadadbhir gūhita*, see Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 56f. [= 1997:45f.]). Surely Madhva is following here the traditional teaching mentioned by Śaṅkara in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* (*ad Sū. I 3,29*) that Mahariṣis restore the Veda together with the Itihāsas

As a matter of fact, the works mentioned here cover the domain of all the unknown sources Madhva quotes in his works. Further, the above-mentioned solemn declaration is not a casual outburst, but rather a fruit of the spiritual appropriation (*āveśa*) of Madhva by Viṣṇu²⁹, a mystical insight (*jñānadīpana*)

hidden at the end of the age through the power of their religious austerities: *vedavyāsas caivam eva smarati* –

*yugānte 'ntarhitān vedān setihāsūn maharāṣayaḥ |
lebhire tapasā pūrvam anujñātāḥ svayambhūvā ||*

Madhva, as an inspired author, is *a fortiori* empowered to do the same by the grace of Viṣṇu (*viṣṇuprasādāt*). As such, he also produces the temporal Veda, namely the fifth Veda, which is *different* from the eternal Vedas: *vedād api paraṃ cakre pañcamam vedam uttamam [...]* iti nārāyaṇāṣṭākṣarakalpe [untraceable] (GīBh p. 2,5f.); cf. also BSūBh (p. 65,24-26): *anuktaṃ pañcabhir vedair na vastv asti kutaścana | ato vedatvam eteṣāṃ yatas te sarva-vedakāḥ ||* iti skānde (untraceable). We might also note that *veda* is put in *samāsa* with *itihāsa* [cf. Arthasāstra I 3,1-2: *sāmargyajurvedās trayas trayī | atharvavedetihāsavedau ca vedāḥ*], since *itihāsa* is the first member of the *pañcamaveda*, cf. ChU VII 1,4: *itihāsa-purāṇāḥ pañcamo vedānām vedāḥ*; see also Mesquita *op.cit.* 126ff.; 157 n. 325 [= 1997: 101ff.; 126 n. 314]. Again, in the Adhyāya (IX 114ff.) in the same contextual connection, Madhva, being *ṛṣīyā bhaumī tanur marutas* (= Marutsuta; see Mesquita *op.cit.* 47f. [= 1997: 57f.]) and a devotee of Viṣṇu at Badarī (!), appears as proclaimer of the eternal Veda as well as of the fifth Veda and also as commentator of the Brahmasūtras: *itthaṃ sa gāyaṇ chatakoṣivistaram rāmāyaṇam bhāratapañcarātram | vedāṃś ca sarvān sahitabrahma-sūtrān vyācakṣāṇo nityasukhodbhāro 'bhūt || [...]* ity [...] viṣṇor eva prasādātāḥ [...] mayeyaṃ satkathoditā; (see Mesquita *op.cit.* 71 n. 122 [= 1997:57 n. 112]). The possession (*āveśa*) of Madhva by Viṣṇu implies that he is personally present in Madhva (see Mesquita *op.cit.* 75 n. 128 [= 1997:59 n. 117]). This intimate relation between Viṣṇu and Madhva allows one to transfer the characteristic qualities of Viṣṇu to Madhva. Their roles are within certain limits interchangeable (cf. *ibid.* p. 78 n. 134 = [1997:62 n. 123]). For this reason, Viṣṇu is ultimately the author of the literary compositions of Madhva without Madhva ceasing to be their author. Accordingly, Viṣṇu is also the author of the Veda (Bhāgavata-tātparyanirṇaya p. 395,5-6):

*vedānām prathamo vaktā harir eva yato vibhuḥ |
ato viṣṇvātmakā vedā ity āhur vedavādīnaḥ ||
iti śabdānirṇaye (untraceable).*

Taking all these points into consideration, I translated *vedetihāsān* in the second verse quoted above as a *karmadhārayasamāsa*. Sharma (2001:27), on the contrary, separates *veda* from *itihāsān* and translates it as a finite verb. His translation is, however, based on the wrong assumption “that the Vedas have already been mentioned in the *plural* as *Vedan* in the first quarter and that the term Veda in the *third quarter* is the *finite verb* of the entire verse.” As a matter of fact, Madhva speaks here of two kinds of Veda, namely eternal Veda as *vedān* and temporal Veda as *pañcamaveda* (= *vedetihāsān*) and they are—according to Madhva—two different collections of texts, as taught in the SkandaP and Nārāyaṇāṣṭākṣarakalpa: *vedād api paraṃ cakre pañcamam vedam uttamam*.

which empowers him to speak on behalf of Viṣṇu. We find the testimony of this experience in several other places. For instance in MBhTN (I 136-137):

viṣṇvājñayaiva viduṣā tatprasādabalonnnateḥ |
ānandatīrthamuninā pūrṇaprajñābhīdhāyujā |
tātparityam śāstrāṇām sarveṣām uttamaṁ mayā proktaṁ |
prāpyānujñāṁ viṣṇor etaj jñātvaiva viṣṇur āpyate 'sau |

Another important statement of Madhva stands in harmony with it, namely that he, as the third *aṁśāvātāra* of Viṣṇu, performs deeds of the Lord: *pūrṇaprajñas tṛtīyas tu bhagavatkāryasādhakaḥ*.³⁰

It is clear that these statements of Madhva bear witness to the fact that he is the composer of all such canonical works. For Sharma, on the contrary [cf. 6], there is only circumstantial evidence for the claim that Madhva could be their author. Since as Sharma attests, "circumstantial evidence is acceptable when direct witnesses are not available," one wonders why Sharma does not give credit to Madhva.

Besides, Sharma apparently tries to depict me as a *śiṣya* of Appayadīkṣita, though it is evident to any careful reader of my book that I dissociate myself from describing Madhva's sources and quotations as *svamātrakalpita* or *svakapolakalpita* as Appayadīkṣita and Varadaguru or other Indian scholars have done.³¹ Nor did I state that Madhva "commits the fraud in honesty," as Sharma tries to make me say [cf. 1].

As concerns Madhva's critics, I tried to explore views put forward by the followers of the Madhva-School, especially by Sharma himself, who criticizes me in this connection for not having consulted his *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta* [cf. 5]. According to him, the Viśiṣṭādvaitin Veṅkaṭanātha too had challenged the genuineness of Madhva's sources. His statement in this regard runs: "The attempt to discredit the sources of Madhva is of much later origin, springing from the days of Appaya Dīkṣita. He was the first to raise the cry which was assiduously taken up by others like Bhaṭṭoji and Veṅkatanātha."³² In commenting on this remark in my monograph I pointed out that a factual historical error was contained in Sharma's statement, since Veṅkaṭanātha lived three centuries before Appayadīkṣita and his pupil Bhaṭṭoji. As I see it, my correct dating of Veṅkaṭanātha destroyed a myth built up around Appayadīkṣita,

30 MBhTN II 118cd; see Mesquita *op.cit.* n. 81f. [= 1997 n. 72f.]; [...] *madhvo yat tu tṛtīyakaṁ kṛtaṁ idaṁ bhāṣyaṁ hi tena prabhau*, see Mesquita *op.cit.* 55ff. [= 1997:44ff.].

31 See *ibid.* p. 14; n. 16 and p. 25 [= 1997:12; n. 9 and p. 21f.].

32 See Sharma 1960:114 quoted in R. Mesquita *op.cit.* 27 n. 28 [= Mesquita 1997 n. 21].

considered among the Madhvites as the *first* person to attack Madhva and his doctrine. And it seems to me that Sharma, in order to keep this legend alive [cf. 5], dropped Veṅkaṭanātha altogether from the list of Madhva's critics! In his review, Sharma states that he does not accept that Veṅkaṭanātha lived during Madhva's time or that he challenged the genuineness of his sources! To these comments he adds the blunt and somewhat cryptic remark: "[...] but this is not the time to discuss the issue in detail," and proceeds with a verbal attack on me: "[...] 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."

Actually, the date of Veṅkaṭanātha (1268-1369) is not controversial,³³ and Sharma himself puts him very close to the time of Madhva [cf. 6]. According to him, Veṅkaṭanātha was a contemporary of the immediate disciple of Madhva, namely Akṣobhya [cf. 6].³⁴ Despite the fact that Sharma distanced himself from his previous position that Veṅkaṭanātha too criticized the unknown sources of Madhva, there is strong evidence for its acceptance. This will be shown here again in brief. In his *Gītātātparyanirṇaya* (ad Gī V 4-5) Madhva says that a householder attains liberation not only by means of ritual but also through knowledge. Without true knowledge—he continues—a correct performance of the ritual acts is not possible (*tasmā jñāninām karmāpy anuṣṭheyam | karminām api gr̥hasthānām jñātavyo bhagavān | na hi jñānaṁ vinā karmaṇaḥ samyaganu-ṣṭhānaṁ bhavati*).³⁵ In order to substantiate this statement Madhva provides the following quotation from the Vyāsasmṛti:

*niṣkāmaṁ jñānapūrvam ca nivṛttam iha cocyate |
nivṛttam sevamānas tu brahmābhyeti sanātanam |
buddhyāvihimsan puṣpair vā praṇavena samarcayet |
vāsudevātmakam brahma mūlamantreṇa vā yatih |
muktir astīti niyamo brahmadṛg yasya vidyate |
tasyāpy ānandavṛddhiḥ syād vaiṣṇavam karma kurvataḥ |*

33 See Singh 1938:3f.; Mesquita *l.c.*; see also G. Oberhammer, who holds to this date (*Materialien zur Geschichte der Rāmānuja-Schule I: Parāśarabhaṭṭas Tattvaratnākaraḥ* [SbÖAW 346 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 14]. Wien: 1979, p. 15), and P.Y. Mumme (*The Śrīvaiṣṇava Theological Dispute. Maṇavālamūnī and Vedānta Deśika*. Madras: 1988, p. 10f.). Varadaguru was immediate predecessor of Veṅkaṭanātha, see S. Stark, *Vātsya Varadaguru*, ed. [SbÖAW 570= Beiträge zur Kultur-und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 4]. Wien: 1990, Teil 1: Kritische Textedition, p. 24f.

34 See Sharma 1960:300; see below p. 195.

35 Since I have discussed this passage in detail in my forthcoming paper on Madhva's concept of *jīvanmukti*, I shall confine the discussion to the subject matter at hand.

karma brahmadṛṣṭā hīnaṃ na mukhyam iti kīrtitam |
tasmāt karmeti tat prāhur yat kṛtaṃ brahmadarśinā |
etasmān nyāsinām lokam saṃyānti grhiṇo 'pi hi |
jñānamārgaḥ karmamārga iti bhedas tato na hi |
tasmād āśramabhedo 'yaṃ karmasaṃkocasaṃbhavaḥ |
iti vyāsaśmṛteḥ |

As a matter of fact, the quotation is not recorded in the Vyāsaśmṛti.³⁶ The first *śloka* is identified by Madhva in Gītabhāṣya (*ad* Gī III 4) as belonging to the Manusmṛti and in Bhāgavatatātparyanirṇaya (p. 660,5-6) as stemming from the Mahābhārata (untraceable!). It is to be noted that the quotation is much closer in wording and content to KūrmaP,³⁷ which Madhva nowhere mentions in this connection. In harmony with Madhva's statement, the first *śloka* also teaches that the ritual acts based on true knowledge bring about liberation. The following five and a half *ślokas* have been spontaneously supplemented by Madhva, with their focus on *yatidharma*, and we see a sudden switch from *grhastha-dharma* to *yatidharma*. The common feature of both *dharma*s is that they, as *nivṛttadharma*, are based on the true knowledge of God. The last one and a half *ślokas* are of special interest for our purpose. They run: "Therefore, the householders, too, are surely equal in rank to the renunciators. For this reason, there is no difference indeed between the path of knowledge and that of ritual acts. On

36 See. Vol. 3 (p. 1631ff.), in: *Smṛtisandarbhā—The Smṛiti Sandarbha. Collection of the [...] Dharmashastric Texts by Maharshies, Vols 1-6*. Delhi 1988. We have here a collection of Smṛti texts with a complete Vyāsaśmṛti, which Sharma was searching for (cf. 2.5.5). However, there are no traces whatsoever of Madhva's unknown quotations attributed to it. I have collected altogether 17 quotations ascribed to Vyāsaśmṛti in Madhva's different works. Not a single one of them could be identified as such!

37 In MuUBh (p. 492,22-23) however, Madhva attributes it again to Vyāsaśmṛti; cf. Manusmṛti (XII 89-90):

iha cāmutra vā kāmyaṃ pravṛttaṃ karma kīrtyate |
niṣkāmaṃ jñānapūrvaṃ tu nivṛttaṃ upadiśyate ||
[akāmapahataṃ nityaṃ nivṛttaṃ ca vidhīyate |
kāmatas tu kṛtaṃ karma pravṛttaṃ upadiśyate ||]
pravṛttaṃ karma saṃsevyā devānām eti sāmānyatām |
nivṛttaṃ sevamānas tu bhūtāny eti pañca vai ||
 also KūrmaP (I 2,63f.):
tasmā jñānena sahitaṃ karmayogaṃ samāśrayet |
pravṛttaṃ ca nivṛttaṃ dvividhaṃ karma vaidikaṃ |
jñānapūrvaṃ nivṛttaṃ syāt pravṛttaṃ yad ato anyathā |
nivṛttaṃ sevamānas tu yāti tat paraṃ padam |
tasmān nivṛttaṃ saṃsevyam anyathā saṃsaret punaḥ |
 [...]

this account, the distinction between *āśramas* narrows [the concept] of *karman* [since *nivṛttam karman* is not a specific feature of the renouncer alone, but also of a householder].” This is taught in the Vyāsasmṛti.

Especially striking in this remark is the fact that the rigid laws of the Brāhmaṇical tradition regarding *āśramas* are downgraded, since the householder is brought clearly into line with the renouncer. And this implies a violation of the strict separation of the four *āśramas* with their respective specific *lingas* and their respective special *dharma*s, as well as a violation of the orderly passage from one *āśrama* to the next envisaged in the *varṇāśramadharmā*. Veṅkatanātha criticizes exactly this point of view in his *Alepamatabhaṅgavāda* when he speaks of ‘abandonment of all *āśramas*’ (*sarvāśramaparitṛyāgokti*) and argues in the following way: “On the contrary, the Veda first establishes the *āśramas* in the passage: ‘There are three divisions of *dharma*,’ and goes on to declare that immortality is gained only by the knowers of Brahman who belong to an *āśrama*: ‘He who is established in Brahman attains immortality’ [ChU 2,23]. The following passage teaches that a knower of Brahman who devotes himself to the householder’s *dharma* until death does not return to this life [...] [ChU 8.15.1]. Passages such as the following, moreover, teach that rites devoid of knowledge produce temporary results, whereas rites accompanied by knowledge produce permanent results [...] [BāU 3.8.10]. It is not possible, therefore, to abandon the *dharma* proper to one’s own *varṇa* and *āśrama* at any time during one’s life.”

A scrutiny of Madhva’s quotation from the Vyāsasmṛti and Veṅkatanātha’s criticism shows that they have a close relationship regarding the points discussed. Nevertheless, a sharp contrast is also noticeable. Madhva does not accept a clear-cut division of *āśramas*: *tasmād āśramabhedo ’yam karmasaṃkocasaṃbhavaḥ*.³⁸ Veṅkatanātha, on the contrary, makes no exception at all regarding the boundaries of the *āśramadharmā*: *ato na kadūcid api yāvajjīvaṃ svavarṇāśramocitadharmaśvarūpatyāgasaṃbhavaḥ*. Whereas Veṅkatanātha bases his teachings on the authority of the Veda, he at the same time makes clear that his opponents can put forward only faked passages in support of their position: “There are other passages which are not found in acknowledged Vedas and *smṛtis*. Sinful people, because of their devotion to opinions that accord with their

38 See Gītābhāṣya (p. 39,17-18): *saṃnyāsaḥ kāmīyakarmaparitṛyāgaḥ | kāmīyānāṃ karmanāṃ nyāsaṃ saṃnyāsaṃ iti vakṣyamāṇatvāt* [= Gītā XVIII 2ab]; *ibid.* (p. 151,18-19): *brahmacārī grhastho vā vānaprastho yatis tathā | yadīcchen mokṣaṃ āsthātum uttamam āśramam āśrayet | iryādivyāsasmṛti (untraceable), see above n. 37.*

See also another untraceable quotation attributed to NārāyaṇaP. (GiBh p. 58,10-13):

conduct, first interpolate them and then claim to find them in some Purāṇas that are not well known, or whose collections are lost, or whose beginnings and ends are not determined [...]”³⁹

In his Yatiliṅgabhedaḥaṅga, Veṅkaṭanātha identifies these authors as some people (*kaiścit*) who quote statements of Vyāsa and of his pupils (*vyāsādivacana*).⁴⁰ Thus it cannot be just coincidental that the source quoted by Madhva to substantiate his peculiar teachings is called Vyāsaśmṛti! Just as the name of this source arouses curiosity, so does the way the quotation was composed. As already mentioned, only the first *śloka*, is traceable to Manusmṛti (XII 89), the rest is supplemented by Madhva, who makes the use of a *lacuna* after *śloka* 89. The editions of the Manusmṛti⁴¹ insert an additional verse in brackets after this *śloka*, indicating that the records of this text are not uniform. And this is precisely the way Veṅkaṭanātha describes non-genuine literary sources to have been composed. Veṅkaṭanātha does not name his opponents, but the details given by him are so accurate that we can easily identify one of them as Madhva.⁴² And

...
madbhaktiś ca viraktiś tadadhiḥkāro nigadyate |
yadādhiḥkāro bhavati brahmacārya api pravajet |
iti nārādīye.

- 39 For transl. see P. Olivelle, *Renunciation in Hinduism. A Medieval Debate, Vol. II, The Viśiṣṭādvaita Argument*. Vienna: 1987, p. 153.
- 40 See *ibid.* P. Olivelle, *op.cit.* p. 153 and 88f.: “[...] With a preconceived sign, therefore, fling the names such as Vyāsa at those who forge such statements, and, like Dharma’s son [Yud-dhiṣṭhira], become a speaker of the truth.” See also Mesquita *op.cit.* 28n. 29-30 [= 1997: 23n. 22f.] and BSūBh (p. 33, 17-18: ... *iti skandavacanāt*).
- 41 See for example Manusmṛti ed. with Maṇiprabhā Hindī Comm. by H. Śāstrī. Varanasi: 1970, and MS ed. with Sanskrit Comm. Manvarthamuktāvalī of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, ed. by J.L. Shastri. Delhi: 1990.
- 42 It is very strange that Sharma makes big fuss in his recent pamphlet (Sharma 2001:17; see above n. 3) over the fact that Veṅkaṭanātha does not mention Madhva while criticizing his unknown sources: “While Appayya has expressly *named* M why has the author of the Alepakamatabhaṅga *not* named M? What is the Professor’s answer to these straight questions? Or, is it all a case of pure hallucination on his part? Who are the Papiṣṭhas Venkatanatha has in mind? We wait for an answer. Or is it a case of Abaddham paṭhitva kucodyam karoti?”

Any scholar engaged in the research of the ancient Indian texts knows that the authors seldom name the persons or texts they criticize. Madhva too follows this custom. Not in a single case does he mention by name his opponents, not even his most hated adversaries, the advaitins he calls *asuras* (cf. Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 528 and 34 [Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya], see above n.7). For instance, he does not mention by name Vimuktātman when he criticizes his *māyāvāda* (see above p. 5) or Sarvajñātman, referred to simply as *māyāvādī*, although he anonymously quotes the Maṅgala-verse from Saṅkṣepaśārīraka (see Vāda p. 48,2-3 and

Sharma's claim against this, that it is highly incredible that Veṅkaṭanātha, alias Deśika, could have accused Madhva of fabricating texts since he declared Akṣobhya, Madhva's disciple, the victor in a public debate on *tat tvam asi* against the Advaita author Vidyāraṇya Veṅkaṭanātha umpired [cf. 6], is pure overstatement—or perhaps just wishful thinking. Sharma passes over the details of this debate recorded in the tradition dating back to the 15th/16th century; he omits for instance that Veṅkaṭanātha was over 90 years old at the time of the debate.⁴³ At this stage he had composed all of his principal works, such as the Śatadūṣaṇī criticizing Madhva's sources; there are no traces of any revision of Veṅkaṭanātha's opinion in his later work, Rahasyatrayasāra, written after this famous debate. Furthermore, how can Sharma be sure that Veṅkaṭanātha's verdict has been given out of sympathy for Madhva's position and not out of his own personal conviction that the Advaita view is wrong, or out of aversion to persons like Vidyāraṇya who hold wrong monistic views? We have strong and solid reasons for the second and third possibilities *only*, for Veṅkaṭanātha has proved in his several books, especially in Śatadūṣaṇī (cf. esp. Vāda 36;37;59; 66), that the monistic view of Advaita was utterly false.⁴⁴ He expressed also in the same work his aversion to Advaitins: "Considering that any contact with them whatsoever, such as speaking with them during a debate, leads to hell, virtuous people keep far from them, and even at the mere sight of them they look at the sun [...] Conversations with them that include such things as studying and teaching 'That art thou' and other Great Sayings, which constitute an assault on *dharma*, are not allowed."⁴⁵ Taking all the above facts into consideration, we can conclude that it is not an ominous Veṅkaṭanātha who is speaking here against Madhva's unknown sources, but the real Veṅkaṭanātha, *alias* Vedānta Deśika,

Mesquita *op.cit.* n. 176 [= 1997: n. 165]), or Śalikanātha when he polemicizes against his *kāryānvitābhīdhānavāda* (see Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 391ff. [Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya]). Similarly, Veṅkaṭanātha in very few cases names his adversaries (see for instance below n. 44). In the Alepakamatabhaṅgavāda and Yatilingabhedabhaṅga, however, he does not specify his opponents by name. But the details given by him are enough to identify one of them as Madhva. And Appayadīkṣita's mentioning of Madhva is explained by the simple fact that he wrote two polemical works against Madhva's unknown sources, namely Madhvatantarmukhamardana, with an Autocommentary Madhvatavidhvāṃsana – *kiṃ bahunā?*

43 See S. Singh, *Vedānta Deśika. His Life, Works and Philosophy – A Study*. Varanasi: 1958, p. 28f.

44 See Tattvaṭīkā (Stanza 5):
śūtitāḥ śatadūṣaṇyāṃ śaṅkarādīmudhāgrahaḥ |
śūtrikaśarīraṃ tu vyaktam atra pradarśyate ||
 cf. also Śatadūṣaṇī (Stanza 3).

45 For transl. see P. Olivelle, *op.cit.* p. 117.

also known as Veṅkaṭācārya and Vedāntācārya, following his predecessor Varadaguru, as I put forward elsewhere.⁴⁶

In closing, I would like to thank and express my appreciation to Prof. Sharma, who is a reputed scholar from within the tradition, for taking interest in my publication. It is however highly regrettable that Prof. Sharma is so obsessed with the defence of the orthodox thinking of the School that he does not focus on the concrete and direct statements of Madhva. My closer scrutiny of these statements has shown that Madhva himself was indeed the author of his 'unknown sources' supporting his peculiar doctrine, and my conclusions have been accepted unanimously by independent scholars. To my surprise I found a cryptic remark in the latest publication of Prof. Sharma⁴⁷ where he does envisage the possibility of Madhva being the author of at least some of his untraceable quotations. The remark, based on the traditional teaching handed down by Śaṅkara in

46 See Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 27f. and p. 172 [= 1997:23f. and 139f.]. In (2001:15; see above n. 3), Sharma contends that Veṅkaṭanātha—mentioned by him in his remark on Madhva's critics, when he places him after Appaya Dīkṣita and Bhaṭṭoji [16th cent.] (see above n. 32)—"is a quite different person, later than Madhusudana Sarasvatī and a cantankerous commentator on the Gita. He has taken M. to task on several occasions." I have been unable to identify this author on the basis of the scanty information Sharma has provided. This is not at all surprising given the "host of similar names of authors, Śrī-Vaiṣṇavites or non-Śrī-Vaiṣṇavites" (see S. Singh *op.cit.* p. 3). And Sharma's short description does not even allow us to decipher whether his 'Veṅkaṭanātha' was a Śrī-Vaiṣṇavite or a non-Śrī-Vaiṣṇavite, whether he criticized Madhva's unknown sources or his other particular teachings. There seems to be no Śrī-Vaiṣṇavite author in the 16th cent. to whom the particulars apply. In his *History of Indian Philosophy* (first Indian edition. Delhi 1975, vol. III: 117), Das Gupta refers to two Śrī-Vaiṣṇavites of the same name, namely Veṅkaṭācārya, also known as *prativādībhaṭṭaśarī*, probably an author of the 16th century, who wrote a *brahmasūtrabhāṣyapūrvapakṣasamgrahakārikā*, as well as *ācāryapañcāśat* and Veṅkaṭanāthārya, author of the work called *śrībhāṣyasāra*. Since none of them wrote a commentary on the Gītā, they cannot be identical with the Veṅkaṭanātha mentioned by Sharma. Even if we admit that there might have been 'Veṅkaṭanātha' in the 16th century, a cantankerous commentator on the Gītā, who criticized Madhva—one critic more than I had originally assumed—this by no means invalidates the fact that Veṅkaṭanātha, alias Vedāntadeśika, was Madhva's outspoken critic long before his namesake of the 16th cent.

Even Sāyana Mādhava (14th cent.), who relates in his *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha* the teachings of Madhva faithfully on basis of his quotations, asserts at the end of his presentation that Madhva *pretends (manyena)* to be the third *avatāra* of Vāyu. In this way, he expresses his doubts about the sources of Madhva, exactly as Appayadīkṣita with his remark: *svakalpita-vāyvatāra*, see Mesquita *op.cit.* p. 29 [= 1997:24].

47 See Sharma 2001:21.

his Brahmasūtrabhāṣya (*ad* Sū I 3,29), runs⁴⁸: “[...] If a gifted genius of *a our times* (sic) can do this, why disbelieve the ability of a great thinker like M to be able to *recapture lost sakhas* (sic) by his Yogic spiritual power, centuries ago, for the benefit of posterity?”⁴⁹

This would imply that the teaching ‘recaptured’ by Madhva is nowhere recorded but in the text passages produced by Madhva himself. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*