

Volume 128 / Number 3 / July–September 2008

ISSN 0003-0279

UNIVERSITÄT WIEN
FB SÜDASIEN-, TIBET-
UND BUDDHISMUSKUNDE

IND-Z-86/128,3



Journal of the

AMERICAN
ORIENTAL
SOCIETY

Madhvas Zitate aus den Purāṇas und dem Mahābhārata: Eine analytische Zusammenstellung nicht identifizierbarer Quellenzitate in Madhvas Werken nebst Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. By ROQUE MESQUITA. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, vol. 24. Vienna: INSTITUT FÜR SÜDASIEN-, TIBET- UND BUDDHISMUSKUNDE DER UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, 2007. Pp. 643.

“Un des traits assez déconcertants de son œuvre,” Suzanne Siauve wrote about Madhva alias Ānandatīrtha, “est le fait qu’il cite un nombre considérable de Śruti inconnues qui, à de rares exceptions près, ne sont utilisées par aucun auteur antérieur ni postérieur à lui, pas même à l’intérieur de son école” (*La doctrine de Madhva* [Paris 1968], 24). Siauve was not one who could be suspected of being unduly critical of Madhva. To the contrary, if anything, reviewers of her works most often found her being partial in his favor (W. Halbfass, *JAOS* 92 [1972]: 176; O. von Hinüber, *Erasmus* 25 [1973]: 775). In fact, Siauve actively defended Madhva’s numerous unverifiable quotations from the *śruti* against accusations of deception and even fraud. His sense of orthodoxy, she said, his respect for the Veda, his wide travels in search of manuscripts, the richness of his library, and his remarkable memory make fraud very unlikely. “S’il avait forgé ses sources il aurait été plus habile” (Siauve 1968, p. 25).

Yet, there have been attacks on Madhva’s method of citing, in support of his novel *dvaita* theory, passages said to be from *śruti* and from *smṛti*, starting soon after Madhva’s time. In addition to Varadācārya’s reference to quotations *kaiścid*, that are *svakapolakalpita*, and Vedāntadeśika/Veṅkaṭanātha’s dismissal of unnamed quotations invented by *pāpiṣṭhāḥ* (P. Olivelle: *Renunciation in Hinduism* [Vienna], vol. 2 [1987], 47, 62–63, and vol. 1, 1986, 115, 153), which may or may not have been specifically aimed at Madhva, the most direct and personal attack on Madhva came in the *Madhvatāntramukhamardana* by the Viśiṣṭādvaitin Appayadīkṣita. Even though, Appaya says in the second and third verses of the text and in his auto-commentary, different branches of Vedānta are acceptable since they differ only in the interpretation of a handful of *sūtras* (*katipayeṣv eva sūtreṣu prakārabhedah*), Madhva’s theory must be rejected out of hand (*agrāhyam eva*), because *Ānandatīrthīye tu yojane prāyaḥ sarvatraiva prakārabhedah*. And in his auto-commentary he lists twenty-nine *śruti* and eleven

smṛti (followed by *-ādi*) totally unknown (*atyantāprasiddha*) titles Madhva introduces in support (*sākṣitayopanyāsaḥ*) of his idiosyncratic theories (*Madhvatantramukhamardana* with the commentary *Madhvamatavidhvaṃsana*, ed. Rāmanāthadīkṣita [Kāśī 1941], 3–4).

The debate about the authenticity of Madhva's quotations was taken up again by Western scholars in the twentieth century. I already referred to Suzanne Siauve, and will restrict myself to just a few other examples. In her doctoral dissertation on Madhva's commentary on the *Kāthopaniṣad* (Leipzig, 1922), Betty Heimann expressed surprise at the many metrical parts of the commentary. She was willing to consider two alternatives: either they were quotations from Āgama texts that were generally known in Madhva's time, "or they were invented by Madhva himself (*ad hoc*?)," and she decidedly leaned toward the latter alternative (pp. 7–8). Helmuth von Glasenapp mentioned the same two alternatives, but he refrained from committing himself in either direction. It is regrettable, he said, that so many quotations remain unidentified, because they would have been Madhva's strongest evidence that his teachings were attested in older texts. The riddle will not be solved, he added, until all Madhva's quotations have been collected and those taken from known sources have been verified (*Madhva's Philosophie des Vishnu-Glaubens* [Bonn, 1923], *25; English translation [Bangalore, 1992], 27).

Indian scholars remained deeply divided in their evaluations of Madhva's theories in general and his quotations in particular. In his widely read *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems* (Strassburg, 1913), R. G. Bhandarkar pointed to Madhva's "almost fantastic manner" of interpreting several *Brahmasūtras*. Had he been able to do so, "[p]robably he would have set aside the *Brahmasūtras* altogether . . . Texts from the *Upaniṣads*, too, which do not agree with his doctrines, he treats similarly" (p. 58). V. S. Ghate copied Bhandarkar, but he phrased his objections in a more powerful language: "les passages (des *Upaniṣads*) se rapportant à la non-différence sont torturés par lui de plusieurs façons" (*Le Vedānta* [Tours, 1918], xxxvii–xxxviii). And, in an article on "The *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* and *Gauḍapāda*," A. Venkatasubbiah referred to some of Madhva's statements as "pure concoction"; he concluded that "Madhva fabricated evidence on a large scale" (*Indian Antiquary* 62 [1933]: 189–90). Modern adherents of Dvaita Vedānta, on the other hand, rose to the defense of their *muni*. The most articulate among these was B. N. K. Sharma, who has written extensively on Madhva and on the history of the Dvaita school. In his *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and Its Literature* (Bombay 1960–61; 2nd ed. Delhi, 1981) he lists ten reasons why, "in fairness to Madhva," his unidentifiable quotations should not be considered to be fraudulent. "We must give Madhva the benefit of the doubt," Sharma concluded, "and not indulge in unseemly charges against a stalwart in Indian thought who, whatever his differences with his compeers like Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, was, in every respect, as great, sincere and trustworthy as any of them" (2nd ed., pp. 86–89). And, in an appendix (pp. 567–70), he included a list of 292 unknown titles, "as a preliminary aid to further investigation of the problem by those who may be inclined to undertake it" (p. 89).

In 1997 Roque Mesquita, the author of the book that has occasioned this retrospect, faced the problem head on in a volume entitled *Madhva und seine unbekannten literarischen Quellen: Einige Beobachtungen* (Vienna: Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, vol. 24). Mesquita paid particular attention to a circumstance which, to Appayadīkṣita, was a mere subterfuge on Madhva's part to cover up his personal role in quoting numerous unknown texts (*tadupanyāsaprasaktasvānāptatva-śaṅkāparihārāya*, ed., p. 4), namely his claim to be, after Hanumat and Bhīmasena, the third *avatāra* of Viṣṇu's son Vāyu, and, thereby, empowered to accomplish the task of Viṣṇu (*bhagavatkāryasādhakaḥ*). By making this claim, Appayadīkṣita said, Madhva had by far crossed the limits of credibility (*prāmāṇikamaryādālaṅghanaṃ bhūyasā dṛśyate*, *Madhvamatavidhvaṃsana*, p. 5).

According to Mesquita, the unknown references to Madhva's works are neither titles of or quotations from old, lost texts, as his supporters maintain, nor are they part of a literary fraud, as his opponents claim. Rather, Madhva was fully convinced that he was an *avatāra*, the result of Viṣṇu having taken possession (*āveśa*) of him. He believed that, by divine grace, he was Viṣṇu's spokesman and the revealer of all canonical texts in the *kaliyuga*. The unknown quotations were composed *ad hoc* by Madhva, as his discourse required, but they were composed under the impulse of Viṣṇu, so that in a certain way the god himself can be considered to be their instigator (p. 12). According to Mesquita, this conclusion applies to all titles of and extracts from otherwise unknown texts and to all passages

Madhva quotes anonymously with *iti (ca)*, provided (1) they occur only in his works and underscore his specific views, (2) Madhva attributes them directly to Viṣṇu, and (3) they refer to or quote works generally acknowledged to be Madhva's (p. 79).

Mesquita's book was extensively and mostly positively reviewed in several, largely western, periodicals; it was not reviewed in our *Journal*. It was hailed as "the first attempt to solve the riddle of Madhva's sources in a systematic and methodic manner" (E. Franco, *WZKSA* 44 [2000]: 237). More than being just a first attempt, "Mesquita's careful examination of Madhva's works has shown the way in which Madhva proceeded in treating sources" (J. W. de Jong, *IJJ* 42 [1999]: 64), and "Dem Vf. aber ist es gelungen, ein lang diskutiertes Problem zu lösen" (O. von Hinüber, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 95 [2000]: 206). Gudrun Bühnemann explicitly recommended the volume to the Indian readership: "This fascinating study [is] deserving of much attention, especially from scholars in India" (*BSOAS* 61 [1998]: 409). Mesquita must have shared Bühnemann's opinion, since "to make the results of this monograph available to English speaking scholars," a complete English translation was published in India (*Madhva's Unknown Literary Sources: Some Observations* [New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2000], 9). Finally, Jan Houben, though considering Mesquita's argument "completely convincing," found the conclusion to be "not as indubitable as the author suggests" (*Asiatische Studien* 54 [2000]: 463). Based on a number of specific examples where Mesquita's arguments might have been formulated more rigorously or where the evidence might allow for a different interpretation, Houben predicted that "some scholars strongly sympathizing with Madhva's religion—perhaps others as well—will seek to contradict Mesquita's main thesis" (p. 466).

Reaction to the book indeed followed soon, in particular by Madhvamunipriya B. N. K. Sharma: *My Latest Four Research Papers*, published by the author (Mumbai 2001; also <http://dvaita.net/pdf/papers/four.pdf>). In the first paper, "Brahmatarka and Other Unknown Source Books of Madhva," based initially on Houben's review and only subsequently on the translation of Mesquita's book, Sharma blamed Mesquita for having re-opened the question "in a big way" (p. 7). He agreed that the problem needed to be investigated, but "without imputing motives of fraud and fabrication and with the courtesy and regard due to the founder of one of the Principal Schools of Vedanta Philosophy," and "without straying into sensitive issues relating to the Avatarhood of the person concerned" (p. 8). In the wake of major socio-religious and political upheavals in the thirteenth century, Sharma said, Madhva made an effort to salvage for posterity as many lost texts as possible by incorporating them into his works. "It would be advisable for the Professor to *withdraw* his charges, *apologise* to Madhva and close the chapter, for good once for all" (p. 34).

Even though Sharma presented him with a copy of his *Latest Four Research Papers*, Mesquita did not apologize. To the contrary, he published, in English, a "Rejoinder: Madhva's Unknown Sources" (*Asiatische Studien* 57 [2003]: 195–212). By the time the rejoinder was written, Mesquita had somehow become aware of another article written by Sharma in collaboration with Shrisa Rao of Mount Mercy College. This text, in which Mesquita was accused of "factual errors of a type not generally expected in mature scholarship, and . . . thus suspect in its core assessments," was inserted in *Asiatische Studien* (57 [2003]: 181–94), immediately before Mesquita's "Rejoinder," in which he in turn referred to Sharma's "selective and biased reading of [Mesquita's] methodological reasoning," and his assuming "an arrogant and rude tone, unusual in serious scholarly discourse" (pp. 195, 196 n. 3).

In his 1997 book, Mesquita unequivocally asserted that his conclusion on the unknown sources of Madhva was not a mere working hypothesis, but the final word on the problem. He added, though, that "[d]ie hier angewandte Methode und die hier erarbeiteten Kriterien im Rahmen einer traditions- und redaktionskritischen Argumentation müssen durch Erforschung anderer Textstellen in vielen Punkten ergänzt werden" (pp. 143–44). He did so in the context of one specific topic: "The Role and Function of God Vāyu in the Philosophy of Madhva" (*IJJ* 46 [2003]: 97–117). In Madhva's unidentified quotations Vāyu, the son of Viṣṇu, becomes the god's *prathamāṅga* or *pradhānāṅga* on earth. Hanumat and Bhīma, Vāyu's sons in the epics, are elevated to being two of his *prādurbhāvas/avatāras*, Madhva being the third. Like Vyāsa, whom Madhva adds as a full *avatāra* next to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, his own duty "is on the intellectual level and consists in imparting knowledge to mankind . . . in the *kali* age" (p. 111). Mesquita's thesis, that "the passages in question were composed by Madhva himself" (p. 97

n. 1), remains unchanged. One of the points raised in the 1997 volume which he again refers to seems, as it now reads, to go against his own thesis of Madhva's authorship of the unidentifiable quotations: "they give the impression that not a single author but many authors were at work in composing them" (p. 98 n. 6). In his 1997 book, however, Mesquita described the variations and inconsistencies in the quotations as nothing less than intentional and indeed meant to mislead the reader: "Sie sollen den Eindruck erwecken, dass hier mehrere voneinander unabhängige Traditionen am Werk sind" (p. 93 = translation, p. 116).

From the time of his first monograph in 1997 onward, Mesquita, with the help of students in his seminars on Madhva's philosophy and methodology, has been systematically collecting unidentifiable quotations in Madhva's works. The result, published in his new volume, is a collection of close to two thousand unidentified *śloka*s attributed to specific sources; verses quoted less specifically such as *śrutismṛtimahāpurāṇeṣu* or anonymously with *iti* or *iti ca* are not included. The volume does include all the texts Madhva attributed to twenty-six different Purāṇas, to the *Mahābhārata* (forty-seven entries), and to the *Harivaṃśa* (thirty-seven). Not a single quotation is assigned to the *Rāmāyaṇa*. For understandable reasons, two *mahāpurāṇas* are missing: the *Śivapurāṇa* and the *Liṅgapurāṇa*. Surprising, on the other hand, is the strong presence of the *Padmapurāṇa* (104 entries) and the *Skandapurāṇa* (129). The quotations Madhva assigns to these two texts are, however, presented as *mohaśāstrāṇi* which, although said to occur in Śaiva Purāṇas, were considered to have been inspired by Viṣṇu (Mesquita 1997: 127; 2007: 22). Two Purāṇas that are less often represented than one might expect are the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (nine entries) and the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (five).

The sections on the *Mahābhārata* and on the individual Purāṇas are introduced with notes, including references to the far rarer identified quotations from these texts. Each entry within the sections starts with a reference to Madhva's work(s) in which the quotation appears, followed by a brief "theme," such as "Erlösung," "Antaryāmin," "Bhakti," etc. This is followed by the quotation accompanied by its immediate context, to show how it fits in Madhva's argument: *tac cokaṃ gārude . . .*, or *. . . iti ca yuktir brāhme*, or *. . . ityādi ca mokṣadharmā*, or *. . . iti vāyuproktavacanā ca śabdena grhītam*. The entry closes with notes on parallel passages in other puranic and epic texts. In the second part of the volume all Sanskrit quotations of the first part are translated in full. Mesquita acknowledges that the terse, often cryptic style of Madhva did not always allow him to go beyond producing a "Stückwerk," in which case he accompanies the translation with a question mark (p. 10). The third part of the book delivers more than the title "Indices" promises. These indexes are valuable research tools, not only for Madhva scholars, but for researchers in a variety of disciplines. An alphabetical index of all the *pādas* of unidentified quotations (176 pages) is followed by a list of unidentifiable titles and quotations in other texts than the epics and Purāṇas, subdivided into *śruti*, *āgama*, and other. The list includes references to Madhva's works only, not the texts of the quotations. The final index is one of the central "themes" (see earlier) covered in Madhva's unidentified quotations.

The massive corpus of data painstakingly collected in this volume is unassailable. On the other hand, the brief introduction relies heavily on Mesquita's 1997 monograph: the new collection of unidentifiable quotations "stellt eine Ergänzung der oben genannten Monographie dar und ist als Arbeitsmaterial für das weitere Studium aufzufassen" (p. 9). Mesquita summarizes and defends the principal conclusions of his earlier book, and he criticizes the Madhva Sampradāya generally and B. N. K. Sharma in particular for refusing "sich an diese durch philologische Untersuchung gesicherten Lehren anzuschliessen" (p. 27). Like the 1997 monograph, the introduction to this volume is written in German; unlike the earlier book it is most unlikely to appear in an English translation. Nevertheless, when this and other reviews written in English are published, we dare, as Houben did earlier, predict yet another response which the strictly philological core of the volume does not warrant.

LUDO ROCHER
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA