

Review of the Roque Mesquita's “Madhva's Unknown Literary Sources” Problems of methodology

Prof. V. N. Pandurangi
Head, Dept. of Darshanas,
J.R. Rajasthan Sanskrit University, Jaipur

Roque Mesquita of the University of Vienna has recently launched a new front in the war against the Dvaitavedanta. In “Madhva's Unknown Literary Sources: some observations”¹ He wants to prove that most of the sources quoted by Madhvacharya in his works are truly composed by Madhvacharya himself as they were/are nowhere and in no time available to other people.

In this small paper I would like to examine his methodology and expose some of the truth, because it is beyond the scope of this work to analyze his full paper.

Reviews are from preface to p. 33 in the descending order.

1. The Western problem

The problem of Western scholars, not certainly all of them; there are some exceptionally good scholars, trying to read and interpret Shashtra works in general and Dvaita works in particular is their lack of serious knowledge of the Shastras. One need to undergo a long and hard training under the qualified Shastragnas to be able to understand and interpret Shastras. It is the one and only one way to get the knowledge of the Shastras. Instead of acknowledging the problem these Western scholars try to read and interpret the texts in their own way which leads them to serious misunderstanding resulting in the mistranslation and misinterpretation as evidenced in my review of Robert Zydenbose.² Moreover the problem gets multiplied as there is no direct engagement between the Indian traditional side and Western side. Biased misunderstanding of the Western scholars leads to many mis-readings such as

आनन्दतीर्थाख्यमुनिः सुपूर्णप्रज्ञाभिधो ग्रन्थमिमं चकार ।

नारायणेनाभिहितो बदर्या तस्यैव शिष्यो जगदेकभर्तुः॥158॥

यस्तत्प्रसादादखिलांश्च वेदान् सपञ्चरात्रान् सरहस्यसंग्रहान् ।

वेदेतिहासांश्च पुराणयुक्तान् यथावदन्या अपि सर्वविद्याः॥159॥ (32.158-9 MBTN).

where Mesquita (preface 1. p.10) misreads and mistranslates verse 159 as follows “He [Madhva] composed also by the grace of Vishnu all the Vedas together with the Pancaraatrasamhitaas, summarizing the secret doctrines [of the Vedas] as well as the [fifth] Veda with Itihaasas and Puranas and also all other Vidyaas in a very exact way”.

Here desperate to prove that Madhvacharya himself composed Vedas etc. Mesquita, totally unable to recognize the word “Veda” in the compound वेदेतिहासांश्च as a verb meaning “to know”, adds a new verb “composed” to fill the gap left by this misunderstanding. This in

¹ Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2000. English Translation of original book in German.

² “A review of ‘Jaina background of Dvaita Vedanta’ by Robert Zydenbos” in Sanskrit-Vimarśah, 15th WSC Special Issue, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, pp. 280-318, Jan 2012. ISSN 0975.

turn has forced him to have two Veda words. Then he interprets the second Veda word by filling one more word “fifth” to avoid the redundancy. Any competent well trained first year student of Samskrita would have got this point clear.

2. Overdependence on the secondary literature in European languages

This type of mistakes could have been avoided had Mesquita paid attention to all the available commentaries and translations of MBTN in Kannada. But arrogance hinders them to come and study with competent Dvaita scholars and to look at the available material. It is the common knowledge that there is a large amount of literature on Dvaita in Kannada language. How can a totally new man to Dvaita venture to study Dvaita without the knowledge of Kannada language and literature in it. These people are eager to prove the low quality of the “literature of vernacular languages” and other secondary literature available in Samskrita by contemporary scholars. Their overdependence on the secondary literature available in European languages is highly disastrous because there is no much material available in English or French and whatever available is misleading and untested/unexamined. We can imagine a situation where a Spanish scholar translates one of the Navyanyaya krodapatras in to Spanish and it gets immediate attention of scholars and everybody thinks that this person is high scholar of Navyanyaya since there is nobody in Spain to see and examine what he has written. I have elaborated on this point elsewhere.³ Here in this book Mesquita quotes sometimes H.Von Glasenapp, Suzanne Siauve, B.N.K Sharma, R.G. Bhandarkar, A. Venkatasubbaih etc. among who none can claim that he has studied the Dvaita literature fully at least all the works of Madhvacharya. Even B.N.K Sharma overawed by European thoughts at the high period of Colonial empire, erred in many places like claiming that Upanishads and Brahmasutras originated from 2nd century CE etc. though he had direct access to Shastras and well-versed than all these persons. Questions like What was Suzanne Siauve’s Dvaita training? How many texts she studied? What was the standard of her Samskrita Language? Etc. stand unanswered to date. She studied for some time with R. Nagaraja Sharma and then with KT Pandurangi who is my own uncle. But none of these two gentlemen knew what she understood and what she wrote in French. Who is there to examine the “stimulating suggestions” (as claimed by Mesquita, p.14) she made? There might be gap between what they taught and what she understood. That is why traditional way teaching, in which classes will begin only after the students restated what is taught earlier, is preferred for Shastra teaching. Without this kind of teaching it will be only anarchy, chaos and disaster.

Local tradition must be honored before you start your global tradition. The very basic idea of the global and local tradition (Mes.p.14) itself very funny. There are only four people working on Dvaitavedanta, and that is called global tradition, whereas there are hundred of scholars working here in Karnataka that is called local tradition.

3. The basic difference between the two sides

Mesquita (p. 13) wrote that “For Madhva’s followers, the genuineness of the sources was a question of faith and therefore they saw no reason to enquire into the subject. On the contrary they viewed such an inquiry as an inexcusable offence against the credibility of Madhva”.

Before we proceed to analyze the statement we need to understand the basic difference of worldview of both sides.

³ “Western Research: Methodology and Trends” lecture delivered in PPSM 19th May, 2012. unpublished paper.

The basic difference between Indian and western views is that while Indian view sees all of the Indian scriptures to be true, western view, which is critical one, sees it as a mere imagination, due to the lack of knowledge of true human nature and its discovery by Indian sages.

What is the purpose of human life? Are we just like all the other creatures of universe i.e. dogs, monkeys, donkeys, horses, cockroaches, etc.? Are we not destined to reach something higher goal as humans? What is the significance of hindu Yogic, Vedic, Ritualistic Saadhanaa and Tantric path? Is it nothing at all? Indian Vedic worldview is for this kind of Saadhanaa and reaching the Brahman at the end. It is The Para Vidyaa for us. It is Upanishad. It has to pass from generation to generation by oral tradition. This is not mere bookish knowledge. It can not be obtained simply by reading Vedic books in universities or doing dry research.

Unless this kind of approach is understood correctly, all the Indian scriptures seem, to a common man, nothing more than childish and meaningless.

The uninitiated man, either from India or West, does not and can not understand the significance of this Vidyaa. Those who deny these Saadhanaa path are fools. They are idiots. Somebody like John Woodroff addressed these people as follows: “He knows not. He knows not that he knows not. He is a fool. Shun him”. Western scholars should understand this thing and then only they will be able to appreciate these Vedas etc.

What Madhvacharya did not preach all of his life is to “eat, drink, marry, and sleep”. His approach to the world was somewhat different. He preached only one thing that is Vishnubhakti. It was the only aim of his life. Vedas were real Saadhanaa path for him and his followers. We think and see all the Vedas and Puranas to be true stories and not just as legends, myths, or simply like Mills and Boons. We believe that Pandavas and Kauravas existed and fought the exact way as narrated by Mahaabhaarta. Rama lived exactly as told by Raamaayana. There is no question of doubt. But for a western brainwashed/educated Indian or western scholar it may all seem to be funny. To him, all our Sandhyaavandana, Puja etc. may seem like dances of uncultured tribes. All the Indians doing aarati to Hanuman idol are fools to them. Let them think the same way, but We need to think of our own destinations and they look at their destination.

Indian tradition is full of the description of innumerable Vedas. The story, in Taittiriya aaranyaka, of Brhaspati being told of infinite Vedas through the example of chains of infinite mountains is famous as well as the famous sentence अनन्ता वै वेदाः. If Veda says Vedas are infinite, we believe it. There is no question. Vedas are the supreme authority of whole Indian tradition, and whole of India is based on Vedas. Vedas are full of descriptions of extra-sensory things. Description of these extra-sensory things is the main aim of Vedas. So if we believe in what Vedas said, then we believe in their infinity also because it is also said in Vedas. For us there will be no difficulty in accepting Madhvacharya’s description⁴ of 24 branches of Rgveda, 101 branches of Yajurveda, 1000 branches of Saamaveda, and 24 branches of Atharvaveda and we believe it. Existence of such a large number of Vedas is corroborated by many texts like Mahabhasya of Patanjali who counted 21, 101, 1000 and 9 branches of these Veda’s respectively, Charanavyuhasuutra⁵ which also counts the same thing, and Prapanchahrdaya⁶ etc. So we assumed that works quoted by Madhvacharya may be parts of these lost works.

⁴ BSB 1.1.1 quoting Skaanda verse.

⁵ With Comm.of Mahidhara, ed. Dogra AnantaramaShastrin, KSS 132.

⁶ Ed. T. Ganapati Shastri, Shivalik Prakashan, Delhi, 2002.

One may ask how Madhvacharya got all these Vedas when they were not available to others? Here is the answer. Vedas are eternal. They can not be destroyed or created. The branches of Vedas which are not available today are not fully lost. They are merely **“not available to Us”** but available to Devataas and Rshis. Madhvacharya got these Vedas from Vedavyasa⁷ who is one of the seven long living persons prostrated daily by Indians. Only Tapasvi purushas get such works from divine sources. Ramanujacharya got Bodhaayana vritti from Kashmir, Subbaraya Shastri got Bharadvaja Vimana shastra from divine source while people like us are not able to get them. Hence we can not say these Vedas never existed at any point of time. Works quoted by Madhvacharya may be parts of vast literature that we never knew it existed. Hence we did not enquire about them when they are not available us. Thus we accept that **“we did not enquire into the subject of unknown literary sources of Madhvacharya”**. But it is not correct to say that **“We (Dvaitins) thought or viewed such an inquiry as an inexcusable offence against the credibility of Madhva”**. Madhvacharya’s philosophy is well based on the available Vedic and Puranic works and these available works are interpreted on the basis of strong logic. Logic is the ground of Dvaita. Hence there will be no difficulty for the main themes of Dvaita even if we assume that “all the unknown sources are false and never existed”. Its philosophical framework is very strong to absorb the shock and repel the strong attacks by Advaitins etc. which were based on the strong logic. Even today classical debates are held routinely between Advaitins and Dvaitins. Dvaitins will not hesitate to debate anything related to Dvaita. **Hence it is wrong to assume that Dvaitins are ashamed or feel offended if this point is discussed.**

The fact that these texts were available with Madhvacharya is corroborated by Sumadhvavijaya which narrates the story of Madhvacharya’s works being stolen by miscreants and returned to him by King Jayasimha.

Where they have all gone?

A question may be raised as to where did all these texts go after the time of Madhvacharya if they were available with him at that time? It is clear that Madhvacharya put them underground at a place called “Kat-tila” near Udupi. It is recorded in Anumadhvacharita as follows ततो दयावारिनिधिर्गामे सेतुतिलाहवये। स्वशास्त्रग्रन्थमकरोद्भूगतं पूर्णशेमुषिः॥ शरच्छते व्यतीते तु विष्णुतीर्थे गुहाचलात्। आगत्योद्धृत्य तत्रत्यग्रन्थान् स प्रचलिष्यति॥ One may try his luck by exploring the are with modern facilities available now. But there is no answer to the question as to why did he made them underground? It may be because that these should not fall at the hands of fools etc. or something else.

4. Hagiography

“The first western scholar who tried to prove the authenticity of Mahdva’s works was the French Indologist Mme. S Siauve. Unfortunately she based her rather hypothetical arguments and risky interpretations mostly on the hagiographical work Sumadhvavijaya (a work mixing facts with legends) and did not take into consideration the factual assertions of Madhva and other redactional arguments in his several works” Mesquita p.14.

Here we need to see what is hagiography? OED⁸ says “hagiography is the writing of saints’ biographies; Saints’ biographies as a branch of literature or legend. The writing of an

⁷ Sumadhvavijaya 8. 4-5.

⁸ Shorter OED, sixth edition 2007.

idealized biography of any person". How does this description fit the work like Sumadhvajaya of Narayanapanditacharya who was a contemporary of Madhvacharya and who swears in that this biography is based on the testimonies of many people who were the witness to the act. If Mesquita thinks that Sumadhvajaya is mixed with legends because of so many unnatural things described in it, it is the problem of his biased view. There will not be biographies of persons of yore and they also can not be. Since people can not see late people they do not believe it. If we imagine a situation where people believe only the thing that they see and nothing else, then what will be evidence for the historical persons? There can be no Ramaayana or Mahabhaarata nor there can be Kings and queens who are not photographed. There will not be Ramanujacharya nor Shankaracharya. Nothing can be believed. There can be no history at all. World would have been inundated by hagiographies. Even Mahatma Gandhi's⁹ description of Rayachandabhai's high memory skills would be unbelievable to them. One can even go to the extent of questioning the very existence of Madhvacharya itself. That will be disastrous.

5. Mesquita's thesis

"The findings of this investigation have revealed that the unknown sources of Madhva are (1) neither ancient works which got lost, as followers of Madhva maintain, (2) nor a literary forgery (स्वकपोलकल्पित) as Madhva's adversaries claim, (3) but "texts" Madava himself produced in sincere obedience to the impelling force of Vishnu and which in a special way can be attributed to Vishnu himself as their author." (Mesquita p.14).

Mesquita proposes that these texts were produced by Madhvacharya himself because of Vishnu's order for that. But he denies that they were स्वमात्रकल्पित or स्वकपोलकल्पित. Thus it seems that Mesquita agrees that all the quoted texts were produced by Madhvacharya himself. But it is not clear from Mesquita's words whether (A) Madhvacharya produced fuller texts of those names but quoted a smaller portions from them or (B) he merely produced only those portions of these texts (which were off course forged to be written by Vishnu) which are quoted? The Second option (B) seems impossible because any opponent would have asked to show other related portions of the same unknown quoted text in one of the numerous debates Madhvacharya held with opponents. For example anybody would have asked him to show that five thousand verses of Brahmatarka when Madhvacharya said that brahmatarka is a work composed by Vedavyasa of five thousand verses. I am sure that everyone who has a brain in India should be agreeing this point that Madhvacharya's opponents would not have left him unquestioned on the texts. Hence it is highly impossible to accept the option (B).

Hence Mesquita seems to be arguing that Madhvacharya produced nearly Four hundred texts of unknown sizes toiling the whole life for it or he had a large number of scholars at his dispense to produce these false texts for him.

If that were to be the case then he must be accepting that the unknown Texts quoted by Madhvacharya certainly existed in the time of Madhvacharya, though allegedly produced by himself. It will lessen our task since the existence of these unknown texts at any point of time is accepted. Thus we need to establish only one fact that **these texts are not written by Madhvacharya**, which is relatively easier task, considering variation of style, contents, corroboration with other texts, availability of the matter in other extant texts etc.

⁹ P. 81-82, An autobiography or the story of My experiments with Truth, Navjeevan Publishing house, Ahmedabad, 2008.

The option (b) will also expect Mesquita to answer where did these texts go after Madhvacharya?

5. Madhvacharya's Guru

Madhvacharya never needed a human teacher to teach him. He did it all by himself right from his childhood. But he was initiated into sannyasa by Achyutaprajnatirtha who was in the lineage of Sanaka etc. But we do not know names of all the of teachers this lineage.¹⁰ However Achyutaprajnatirtha is not named anywhere by Madhvacharya, since after initiating the Madhvacharya into sannyasa Achyutaprajnatirtha himself became a disciple of Madhvacharya. It is the Vedavyasa who taught and gave all the texts to Madhvacharya. It is clearly stated by him in MBTN 32.160-163

समस्तशास्त्रार्थविनिर्णयोयं विशेषतो भारतवर्त्मचारी ।

ग्रन्थः कृतोयं जगतां जनित्रं हरिं गुरुं प्रीणयतामुनैव॥160॥

विनिर्णयो नास्त्यमुना विना यद् विप्रस्थितानामिह सर्ववाचाम् ।

तद् ब्रह्मसूत्राणि चकार कृष्णो व्याख्या तथैषामयथाकृतान्यैः॥161॥

निगूहितं यत् पुरुषोत्तमत्वं सूत्रोक्तमप्यत्र महासुरेन्द्रैः ।

जीवेश्वरैक्यं प्रवदद्भिरुग्रैर्व्याख्याय सूत्राणि चकार चाविः॥162॥

व्यासाज्ञया भाष्यवरं विधाय पृथक्पृथक् चोपनिषत्सु भाष्यम् ।

कृत्वाखिलान्यं पुरुषोत्तमं च हरिं वदन्तीति समर्थयित्वा॥163॥

Here is referring to Krishnadvaipaayana by the word Krishna (v.161) and Vyaasa (v.163)

देवं नारायणं नत्वा सर्वदोषविवर्जितम् । परिपूर्णं गुरुश्चान् गीतार्थं वक्ष्यामि लेशतः ॥

Here word Aan is referring to Vedavyasa.

In Nyaayavivarana Madhvacharya pays tribute to Vyaasa.

कृत्वा भाष्यानुभाष्येहमपि वेदार्थसत्पतेः। कृष्णस्य सूत्रानुव्याख्यासन्न्यायविवृतिव स्फुटम् ॥12॥

करोमि मन्दबुद्धीनां बुधानां चोपकारिकाम्। प्रीत्यै तस्यैव देवस्य तत्प्रसादपुरःसरः ॥13॥

Hence it is not correct to claim that “Vishnu is his only Guru. Nowhere in the works of Madhva did I find a corroboration for the opinion in Sumadhvavijaya...that Madva acknowledges Vyasa as his teacher. In all places where Vishnu is praised as Guru, he does not appear in the form of Vyasa” (Mesquita p.17). It is also not correct to claim that “Madhva's teaching does not depend on a guruparampara”, because even all the Acharyas teaching does not depend on guruparampara. What was the guruparampara of Shankaracharya? What was the guruparampara of Gaudapada? What was the guruparampara of Govindabhagavatpada? We do not know it. How the Prabhaakara system of Purvamimamsaa began? It began with Prabhaakara himself. There is no need to connected with Guruparampara to establish something. If Madhvacharya started something on his own it was his specialty. It should not be a issue.

6. Deviation from established path

His deviation from the different traditions of Vedanta should also be treated in this way. What is wrong if somebody deviates from established path? Is there any ordinance promulgated by Parliament or King that nobody should deviate from Shankaracharya's path?

¹⁰ And nobody has the full list of a lineage of any Acharya, be it Shankaracharya, Ramanujacharya or anybody else, because the lineage of Acharyas is so big and continuous for several thousand years. Who was Shankaracharya's Guru, who was his guru, who was his guru? No. We do not know. It may be cut down in between. Whatever the list prepared by the people of last centuries like Ramanandacharya's or Shankaracharya's is fictitious. There are no evidences to know predecessors of Shankaracharya etc.

Hence Bhandarkar, Ghate etc. (quoted by Mesquita p. 20, n.15, p.25. n. 27) have no right to dictate how should Madhvacharya write his bhasya or how should he formulate his teachings. Indian philosophical system would have collapsed had such a rule been there to dictate that one should not deviate from trodden path. **It is fundamentalism. It is Talibanism. It is not acceptable in academic matters.** Here a famous line of Gadadhara comes to the mind as to “No illogical-diktat of an author will block us from accepting something based on the power of reasoning”.

7. Philosophical Issues

If Mesquita wants to prove that Madhvacharya’s interpretations of Vedic sentences are “**rather artificial, risky and coercive**” he should come to Bengluru and challenge and defeat the Dvaita people there in direct debate. Philosophical issues are different and philological issues are different. Philosophical issues are dealt everyday by Madhvacharya’s followers and answers would be ready instantly.

8. Venkatanatha as Madhvacharya’s critic?

Mesquita names two persons as critics of Madhvacharya. According to Mesquita Venkatanatha alias Vedantadeshika was an outspoken critic criticized Madhva in his Alepakamatabhanga of Shatadushanii¹¹ vol.4, p. 317. Let us see the exact sentences of Venkatanatha to determine whom he is addressing.

एतेन “न कर्मणा न प्रजया धनेन त्यागेनैके अमृतत्वमानशुः” “न्यास एवात्यरेचयत्”, “तस्मान्न्यासमेतेषां तपसामतिरिक्तमाहुः” इत्यादि, “किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे किं प्रजया करिष्यामः येषां नो अयमात्मा ब्रह्म (अयं) लोक” इत्यादिकमपि धर्मविशेषादिविषयतया तत्रत्यात्मसमर्पणादिविषयतया वा यथायथं निर्बोद्धव्यम्। अतः सर्वाश्रमपरित्यागोक्तिसंभवेऽपि प्रागुक्त एव न्यायः। न च तथास्ति। अपि तु “त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धा” इत्याश्रमान् विधाय “ब्रह्मसंस्थोमृतमेति” इत्याश्रमनिष्ठानामेव ब्रह्मविदा(म)मृतत्वं श्रूयते। “स खल्वेवं वर्तयन् यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते न च पुनरावर्तते न च पुनरावर्तते” इति यावज्जीवं गृहस्थधर्मनिष्ठस्य ब्रह्मविदोपुनरावृत्तिराम्नाता। “यो वा एतदक्षरं गागि” इत्यादौ च ज्ञानरहितकर्मणामन्तवत्फलसाधनत्वं ज्ञानपूर्वककर्मणां स्थिरफलसाधनत्वं चोक्तम्।

अतो न कदाचिदपि यावज्जीवं स्ववर्णाश्रमोचितधर्मस्वरूपपरित्यागसंभवः।

यानि चान्यानि वाक्यानि संप्रतिपन्नश्रुतिस्मृतिष्वदृश्यमानानि स्वाचारानुरूपमतपरिचर्या केषुचिदप्रसिद्धेषु वा नष्टकोषेषु वा अनिरूपितमूलाग्रेषु वा पुराणेषु प्रक्षिप्य पठन्ति पापिष्ठाः, तानि प्रत्यक्षश्रुत्यादिपरिशीलनशालिनीषु गरिष्ठगोष्ठीषु नावकाशं लभन्ते। तत्प्रामाण्येऽपि “प्रसिद्धाविरोधेन नेतव्यम्” इत्यत एवेतान्यपि निर्व्यूढानि।

Here it is the alepakamatabhanga section of Shataduushanii. Who are the alepakas. Venkatanatha (ibid. p.287) says ¹² “Here in this world there are some people, who have thrown out all the dharmas of varna and aashrama, are very similar to chandalas. They intermingle with a community including chandalas, without any vidhi or nishedha. They claiming to be brahmavid, are maligning the world. Sajjanas, who think that even speaking to these people will result in hell, see the Sun [to get rid of the sin of] when they see these people”.

¹¹ Shataduushanii, Duushanas 43-66, Fourth Part, ed and translator Shivaprasad Dvivedi, Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Vidyabhavan Prachyavidya Granthamala 24, Varanasi, Vaikramabda 2044.

¹² इह जगति केचित् अवधूतसकलवर्णाश्रमधर्माश्चार्वाकसधर्माणः आचण्डालमेकराशीभूय विधिनिषेधयन्त्रणामतन्त्रयन्तः पारिभाषिकब्रह्मविदो विश्वमाविलयन्ति। तैस्सहवादरूपसंभाषणादिकमपि निरययातनमिति मन्वानाः तद्दर्शनेऽपि सर्वलोकलोचनमवलोकयन्ति सन्तः।

Hence it is clear that Venkatanatha is refuting these people who claim to be followers of Vaidika dharma but in fact do not follow any aashrama and varna dharmas. Mesquita is betraying his incompetence of Sanskrit language and capacity to understand a clear sentence by alleging that Venkatanatha is refuting Dvaitavadins in this context. In fact the Venkatanatha (Verse no. 3. vol.1. p.4) shows his respect to Madhvacharya in the very beginning of Shataduushanii.

प्राचीमुपेत्य पदवीं यतिराजजुष्टां तत्संनिकृष्टमथवा मतमाश्रयन्तः।

बाला यथोचितमिदं शुकवत्पठन्तः प्रच्छन्नबौद्धविजये परितो यतध्वम्॥

“Hey Young ones! Either sided with the old path shown by Yatiraaja (Ramauja) or siding with path (Dvaitavedanta) which is very similar to Ramanuja’s path, reciting this shataduushanii, you must resort to defeat the disguised Bauddhas (Advaitins)”

He, in Shataduushanii, even reproduced two sutras of Devamimamsaa¹³ स विष्णुराह हि and तद्ब्रह्मेत्याक्षते (both sutras quoted by Madhvacharya) by indirectly quoting Madhvacharya.¹⁴ Devamimamsaa is/was not available to anybody except Madhvacharya. Neither Ramanujacharya nor Shankaracharya had it with them. Venkatanatha also named Madhvacharya as तत्त्ववादिवृद्ध elsewhere. Hence the criticism in alepakamatabhanga can not be directed at the Dvaita school but aimed at those who deny varnaashramadharmas. (it is very clear who they are. there is no need to name them). In fact Venkatanatha never criticized Dvaitavedanta in any of his works. He was in a harmony with Dvaita. How can Venkatanatha criticize Madhvacharya with forging documents when himself is quoting from Madhvacharya.

Even the commentary on Yatingabhedhabhanga section of Shataduushanii, which is quoted by Mesquita to be refuting Madhvacharya has nothing to do with Philosophy at all or Dvaita Vedanta to be considered. It is refutation of some matters related to Shikhaa and Yajnopavita of Sannyasins.

Thus it seems Mesquita has not at looked what are subjects of these texts and sections thereon, but he is making false allegations based on the second hand writings of other blind persons. It is not clear on whom Mesquita is basing in this context. Shataduushanii is not even mentioned in the bibliography of Mesquita. That shows Mesquita has not bothered to lift that book from rack. This kind of pseudo scholars should not be entertained. Instead they should be boycotted. But it seems that western academia has a long habit of being based and progressing on the basis of such third class literature.

¹³ Devamimamsaa is also described in Prapanchahrdaya of anonymous author. All the contents of four adhyayas of Devamimamsaa are given there.

¹⁴ निरीश्वरत्वसेश्वरत्वाभ्यां विरोध इति चेन्न जैमिनीयसूत्रेष्वपि ईश्वरप्रतिक्षेपादर्शनात्। अर्वाचीनव्याख्यातृजल्पितानां तु अनादरणीयत्वात्। अत एव शेश्वरमीमांसाक्षेपोपि नातीव विच्छिन्नः, परैरनूद्यते च। देवताकाण्डं च कर्मकाण्डशेषतया भाष्यकारादिभिः परिगृहीतम्। तदुक्तं संकर्षे इति तत्रत्यसूत्राणि चोदाहरन्ति। तस्य च काण्डस्योपसंहारेपि अन्ते हरौ तद्दर्शनात् इति देवताकाण्डां प्रदर्श्य स विष्णुराह हि इति सर्वदेवताराधनानां तत्पर्यवसानाय तस्य सर्वान्तरात्मत्वेन व्याप्तितं प्रतिपाद्य तं ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते तं ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते इति तस्यैव वेदान्तवेद्यपरब्रह्मत्वोपक्षेपोपसंहारात्, सामान्यतोपि विशेषतश्च चेश्वरः प्रस्तुत इति तत्त्वविदां संप्रदायः। (शतदूषणी ऐकशास्त्र्यसमर्थनप्रकरणे)।

9. Appayyadikshita

Hence it clear that Appayyadikshita who is three centuries later to Madhvacharya is the first person to raise the issue of unknown texts. But he too, discussed this issue in only three pages (of which two pages are full of Chinnasvami Shastrins notes) of his ninety-seven page book called Madhvatrantramukhamardana¹⁵. He would have written a whole book had he been highly concerned about the unknown texts. In fact, he did not so, instead he has tried to refute the Dvaitavedanta on the basis of only reasoning power or yuktis. And he is amply criticized, in turn, by Vijayeendratirtha¹⁶, Narayanacharya¹⁷, and Vanamali Mishra¹⁸. It is well known fact that points of debate between Dvaita and Advaita are well defined from the time of Vyaasatirtha and Madhusudanasarasvati with Nyayamrta and Advaitasiddhi. Advaitins were and are well aware of the fact that Dvaitavedanta can not be refuted by mere allegations of unknown sources or the refutation of Avataarahood of Madhvacharya, but only the clear reasoning power. Hence both are engaged in a long battle using all their might of Vyakarana, Nyaya and Mimamsa styles of reasoning. Appayadikshita tried his best to refute Dvaitavedanta in his works such as Madhvatrantramukhamardana, Siddhantaleshasangraha, Nyayarakshamani, Parimala, Shivaarkamanidipikaa, Upakramaparakrama etc. This intensity of attack by Appayyadikshita shows he was well aware of the fact that he was alone in attacking the sources of Madhvacharya. Nobody from other philosophical systems tried to burn his hand in this forgery-allegation or avataarahood of Madhvacharya though hundreds of scholars of past have tried to refute Dvaitavedanta philosophically or otherwise. Even Madhusudana Sarasvatii etc. who are the most fierce critics of Dvaita never resorted to criticize Dvaitavedanta of forgery of books or avataarahood. Hence we can conclude that nobody criticized Madhvacharya on his sources except Appayyadikshita.

Appayyadikshita would have refuted only the avataarahood of Madhvacharya and nothing else as noted above had he been maintaining that the credibility Madhvacharya's unknown texts is purely based on his claim that he is an avataara of Vaayu as noted by Mesquita (p. 32).

It should be noted that Appayyadikshita did not stress on heavily the avataarahood issue because he was aware that this issue will trouble all the Acharyas. Shankaracharya was held by his disciples as the avataara of Shankara, and Ramanujacharya as a avataara of Shesha, more interestingly Appayyadikshita himself being called as Shiva's avataara¹⁹ by his own clan. It is common in Indian philosophy.

Moreover one should know that nobody became a disciple of Madhvacharya because Madhvacharya proclaimed himself as an avataara. It is not a Satya Sai Baba story. Madhvacharya defeated those scholars who encountered him in debates and then made them disciples. We can say that, even today, none of the learned disciples in Madhvacharya's own sampradaaya accepts his teaching only on the basis of him being avataara. Our acceptance of Madhvacharya's teaching is purely based on the logical correctness, its being in accordance of Vedas and Puraanas.

10. Lost texts: a general note

¹⁵ With notes of Chinnasvami shastri, ed. Ramanatha Dikshita, Kashi, 1941.

¹⁶ Madhvatrantramukhabhushana.

¹⁷ Advaitakalana.

¹⁸ Madhvamukhalankara.

¹⁹in Shivarahasyapuraana, and Nilakanthavijaya by his grand nephew Nilakanthadikshita. Introduction by Ramanathadikshita in Madhvatrantramukhamardana mentioned above.

These persons who are worried about the unknown sources of Madhvacharya should also think about some of the biggest losses of texts reported elsewhere.

Lost Vedic works

It is clear from Mahaabhaashya etc. quoted earlier **We have** lost most of the vedic branches in the last five thousand years. Charanavyuhasutras and other texts such as Aashvalaayanagrhyasutra (3.4.5²⁰) mention many of the Shaakhaapravartaka Rshis. But we do not know exactly who they were? how they were? For a conspiracy theorist like Mesquita it is all forgery. But we need to take a well-debated view of these branches. We have a long list of Rshis in Vamshabrahmanas in Upanishads such as Chandogya etc.

Madhusudan Ojha also listed many Shaakhaas in संशयोच्छेदवाद.

Venkatanatha's quotations from Pancharaatras

Venkatanatha²¹ himself has quoted verses from nearly 50 Pancharaatra and other texts which are not available today.

Kaviindracharyasuuchiipatram

Kaviindracharyasuuchiipatram²² which is the list of collection of books in the library of Kavindracharya Sarasvatii in Varanasi who lived around 1656. Kavindracharya or his disciples after death fled Varanasi because of Muslim attack by distributing most of his library among his disciples. While some of the works listed in this suuchii are found in MS libraries across the country, most of them are permanently lost. What we have with us in Oriental Institute, Baroda, is only the list. It contains the list of around 21 Ramayanas, 18 chief smritis, 18 sub smritis and 34 kittaa smritis, as many as Puranas, which we do not know even by names. What happened to all these works? Is the list of works is a case of forgery?

Kavindracharya suchi patra lists (235) ब्रह्मसूत्रबोधायनवृत्ति (236) दैवीमीमांसाटीका भाष्यसहित (p.5) under vedantashastra. It also lists (288) भक्तिमीमांसा (289) शाण्डिल्यसूत्र. And under sutras it lists (339) परमानन्दसूत्र (340) आर्षस्तबकसूत्र.

Manusmrti's lost verses

²⁰ सुमन्तुजैमिनिवैशम्पायनपैलसूत्रभाष्यभारतमहाभारतधर्माचार्याः जानन्तिबाहविगाग्यगौतमशाकल्यबाभ्रव्य-
माण्डव्यमाण्डूकेया गार्गी वाचकनवी वडवा प्रातिथेयी सुलभा मैत्रेयी कहोळं कौषीतकं महाकौषीतकं पैङ्ग्यं
महापैङ्ग्यं सुयजं शाङ्खायनमैत्रेयं महैत्रेयं शाकलं बाष्कलं सुजातवक्त्रम् औदवाहिं महौदवाहिं सौजामिं
शौनकमाश्वलायनं ये चान्ये आचार्यास्ते सर्वे तृप्यन्तु (आ.गृ.सू. 3.4.5) कृष्णद्वैपयनाय जातूकर्णाय
तरुशाय तृणबिन्दवे सोमशुष्मिणे सोमशुष्काय वर्मिणे सनद्वाजाय बृहदुक्थाय वामदेवाय वाचरत्नाय
हरितयज्वनः (ने) उदमयाय गौतमाय ऋणंजयाय कृतंजयाय बभ्रवे त्र्यरुणाय त्रिधातवे त्रिवर्णाय शिबिन्ताय
पराशराय वशिष्ठाय इन्द्राय मृत्यवे कर्त्रे त्वष्ट्रे धात्रे सवित्रे भृतश्रवसे सावित्र्यै वेदेभ्यश्च इति पृथक् एते
चतुस्त्रिंशदष्टयः (आप.गृ.सू.व्याख्या हरदतीया 4.12.)

²¹ Saccharitraraksha, Pancharaatrarakshaa, Niksheparakshaa, Chatuhshlokiibhaashya, ed. T. Viraraghavacharya Adyar. 1969.

²² Edited by R. Anantakrishna Shastri, GOS, 17, Baroda.

Shivaraja acharya koundinyayana of Nepal has compiled a list of lost verses of Manusmṛti in his edition of Manusmṛti²³. He has collected the verses of Manu quoted in 32 different works (from Tantravaartika of Kumarila to Shankaravijaya), but not available in present version. Are all these works are making a literary forgery?

Pancaratra texts

Daniel Smith²⁴ and others have collected a list of lost Pancaratra texts. Are these works forgery? We have dealt this subject in a separate paper on Pancaratra²⁵. See also Vrajavallabha Dvivedin's "Luptaagamasangraha"²⁶ and "Vaishnvaagamavimarsha"²⁷ for the details of some of old texts now lost, but quoted in later texts.

11. Conclusion

Hence we can not say definitely that all the unknown texts quoted by Madhvacharya did not exist at all. **What one can prove is their non-availability only, and not certainly non-existence.** Thus Mesquita's conclusion that the unknown sources of Madhvacharya never existed before or after Madhvacharya, but produced by himself and incorporated in his texts to give authenticity to his teachings is a baseless allegation purely based upon the Eurocentric colonial viewpoint, that only deserves to be rejected out rightly. But we should thank him for raising this issue and compiling long lists of quotations from Puraanas and Vedas. I conclude, this small paper which reviews Mesquita only upto p. 33 only, hoping that I will write further on Mesquita's present work, thus a full review of the work will be available soon.

²³ P. 893-936, Chowkhamba vidyabhavan, Varanasi, 2007.

²⁴ Pancaratranoovilakkam, Chennai 1967.

²⁵ For details see my paper "Pancaratra Texts and Madhvacharya" to appear in Prajna 8, 2014

²⁶ Varanasi, 1983.

²⁷ Pub. by SSU, vaaranasi, 1997.