

99
105
104
1240975
13.N.3
1996

ISSN 0970-7794

*Journal of
Indian Council
of Philosophical
Research*

4

JICPR
Editor DAYA KRISHNA

52



VOLUME XIII NUMBER 3
MAY-AUGUST
1996

Potter's New Bibliography of Indian Philosophy:
One Step Forward and Three Steps Backwards

DAYA KRISHNA

Jaipur

Karl H. Potter's *Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies** has by now become a standard reference work in the field of Indian philosophy and its first volume devoted to the *Bibliography* of the subject is the most exhaustive reference tool on what has till now been published in the field of Indian philosophy or even referred to in catalogues of manuscripts, or even in important articles on the subject. The *Bibliography* was first published in 1970 and the second revised edition was published in 1983. The present *Bibliography* in two parts is the third revised edition and thus contains the most up-to-date information regarding both primary and secondary materials relating to Indian philosophy in the English language. One would normally have expected that the editor himself would have highlighted the points in which his third revised edition differs from the earlier ones and what improvements have been made in it, but, nothing of the kind is provided by the editor and the reader is left to his or her own devices to find what exactly has been done in the new edition of the *Bibliography* to make it more serviceable to the research-oriented student of the subject.

The first change which strikes one is the division of the *Bibliography* into two parts, the first part containing only the original works in Indian philosophy while the second part consists of secondary material such as articles, etc. on various schools of Indian philosophy or subjects dealt with therein. This is a welcome change as the primary and the secondary material have been separated, though it appears that the editor has not been able to observe the principle of separation completely as he has referred to articles even in the first part which primarily contains the original works only. At places, the inclusion of an article was perhaps justified because the original author is only known through reference and discussion in the article concerned. But this is not always the case.

The second obvious difference is the numbering of the entries which was totally absent in the second revised edition where, if one had to find the total number of entries, one had to count them oneself. As against this, for some reason, the editor has chosen to eliminate the indication of the date of the authors in the upper margin of each page to help one find the period to which the authors mentioned on the page belonged. One now has to search for the dates against the name of the author

* *The Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies: Bibliography* (third edition), compiled by Karl H. Potter, published by Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, Vol. I, parts 1 and 2, pp. 1-1606, Rs 800.

which is certainly a little more cumbersome than the earlier practice. It would have been far better, if the earlier practice had been retained where the dates were given both in the top margin as well as against the author concerned. In fact, the new edition makes it very difficult to locate either by chronology or by names of schools as nothing is indicated at the top of the page to help the serious enquirer. As for the index, there seem to be so many mistakes in it, that one has difficulty in finding works in the main *Bibliography* which is divided into two parts, the index being at the end of the second part only, thus making one rush from one part of the volume to the other to find what one is looking for.

As the dating of the authors or the works is an important information to be provided by the *Bibliography*, it would have been helpful if the basis of the dating would have been clearly indicated. However, this is not the case and one is left to guess the grounds of the dating which the editor had in his mind, particularly when the dates given are too precise as has been done in the *Bibliography*. The situation in fact is even more complicated, for if one compares the dates in the old edition with those in the new, one finds that the changes in certain cases are so marginal that one wonders what could possibly be the ground for the change, specially when it spans only a few years (Appendix I). Surely, such a precise dating for most of the works and authors in Indian philosophy is not there, and if the grounds for it were available to the editor, he should certainly have shared them with the user of the *Bibliography*. What is even more disturbing is the unbelievably large shifting in the dates of many authors, some of whom are extremely important in the history of the development of Indian philosophy, without any inkling being given of the reasons for such a change or the grounds on which it has been made (Appendix II). As this is not an isolated occurrence in the *Bibliography* but is a fairly widespread phenomenon we will try to highlight it and make it a subject of discussion amongst concerned scholars so that it does not escape the attention of the scholarly community.

What is, however, even more surprising is the fact that not only the third edition of the *Bibliography* makes minor changes of a few decades in the case of many authors, it also eliminates some of those who were mentioned in the second edition (see Appendixes III and IV). This is absolutely incomprehensible, for if the authors did exist and their works published, then how could they disappear from the revised *Bibliography*? Equally baffling are the instances where the works whose dating is shown as known in the second edition become of unknown date in the revised edition. In case there were substantial grounds for doing so, they should have been pointed out in the Introduction to the third edition. But nothing of the kind has been done. In fact, the unwary reader may not even be aware that such an elimination or change has been done in the third edition of the *Bibliography*.

But this is not the only anomaly one finds in the third edition of the

Bibliography. What is even more surprising is that many of the names mentioned in the index are not to be found in the *Bibliography*, and one wonders how, if they are in the index, which obviously is prepared only after the main text is ready, they have disappeared from the *Bibliography* (see Appendix V).

The third edition lists 1962 entries, 518 more than the entries in the second edition. The present edition lists authors and works up to 1991 while the earlier edition listed only up to 1976, and this obviously could be one of the reasons for the increase in the number of entries in the later edition. But as there are only 23 new entries from 1976 to 1991, this fact alone cannot account for the substantial increase in the number of the entries in the third edition of the *Bibliography*. On the other hand, this fact points to a decline of publications in the field of philosophy in Sanskrit during the later half of the twentieth century as normally the *Bibliography* seems to include everything published in the field of philosophy in India, whatever be its nature and quality.

The present *Bibliography* contains 518 more entries than those which were there in the second edition. If one breaks it centurywise, one finds:

Century	More	Less
300-200 BC	9	
200-100 BC	1	7
100-000 BC	1	
AD 0-100		10
AD 100-200	29	
AD 200-300	51	
AD 300-400	54	
AD 400-500	35	
AD 500-600	38	
AD 600-700	34	
AD 700-800	33	
AD 800-900	7	
AD 900-1000	59	
AD 1000-1100	1	
AD 1100-1200	5	
AD 1200-1300	1	
AD 1300-1400		4
AD 1400-1500	14	
AD 1500-1600	33	
AD 1600-1700	8	
AD 1700-1800	27	
AD 1800-1900	19	
AD 1900-1991	81	
	539	21

The above centurywise breakup of additions in the new *Bibliography* is interesting in many respects and raises new questions which need to be investigated. The largest number of new additions occur in the period AD 900 to AD 1000 (59) followed by the one from AD 1900 to AD 1991 (58), if we subtract those which have been added only because the period covered has been extended from 1976 to 1991, the next largest number occurs in the period AD 300-400 (54) and AD 200-300 (51). In fact the period AD 200-400 witnesses 105 new entries. The next largest addition occurs between AD 500-600 (38) followed by AD 400-500 (35), AD 600-700 (34), AD 700-800 (33), AD 1500-1600 (33) and AD 100-200 (29).

The period from AD 100-1000 thus sees an addition of 340 new entries. The only strange thing in this period is that there are very few new entries in the period between AD 800-900 (07). The period from 300-100 BC sees only 2 new additions while from BC 100 to AD 100 there are 09 less entries, presumably because the authors/works earlier listed during this period have been shifted elsewhere or omitted altogether. The second millennium AD that is, from 1000 onwards sees a total of (189-23), that is 166 new entries in the *Bibliography*. During the second millennium we have only 4 less in the period AD 1300-1400, most probably due to the same reasons as were mentioned earlier.

Thus, if in the first millennium AD we include entries from BC 300 to AD 1000 we have a total number of 333 additions out of which we find that 307 happen to be Buddhist, the rest, 26 in number, being distributed amongst the other schools of Indian philosophy, namely, Jain, Nyāya, Vedānta, etc., including those which have been placed in the category of 'general' in the *Bibliography*. As for the second millennium AD, one of the interesting features seems to be the increase in the discovery of works belonging to the less well-known schools of Indian thought.

Viśiṣṭādvaita	21
Dvaitādvaita	10
Śaiva Siddhānta	11
Kāśmīra Śaivism	4
Vīra Śaiva	16
Acintyābheda	21

Besides these unbelievable omissions and commissions, one would have normally expected that the mistakes committed in the second edition of the *Bibliography* would have been rectified in the later edition, but it is surprising to find the same mistakes being repeated, including the ones that would be normally expected to have come to the attention of the editor in the course of getting the scholarly information on the subjects concerned. To give a few examples, Vācaspati Miśra II's *Nyāyasūtrōddhāra* was mentioned as being partly in MS according to Dinesh Bhattacharya, (*History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithila, Darbhanga 1959*, p. 147. Cf. also Umesh Mishra, *History of Indian Philosophy*, volume two,

1970, p. 292. [Potter, p. 530 of Vol. I, Section II] even thought it was published as early as 1896 by Pandita Gaṅgādhara Śāstri Tailang as a text of the Nyāya Sūtra with Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya* in the Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, Vol. IX. This, in fact, was pointed out in my article entitled, 'The Text of the Nyāya Sūtras—Some Problems' published in *JICPR* (Vol. VII, No. 2, Jan.-Apr. 1990). But the mistake has been repeated in the third edition. Similarly, for example, it was mentioned in the second edition that Karuna Bhattacharya has written an article in French (p. 395, Karuna Bhattacharya) which, on enquiry, was found to be wrong as it was not she who had written the article but someone else in Calcutta. However, in the new edition she is again credited with having written an article in French which is unlikely as she has no knowledge of the language.

There are also many printing errors and one wonders if anyone has taken serious care to see that the volume is as free of errors as it could be. All in all, it seems to be a job carelessly done and perfunctorily performed without any regard for the convenience of its users. However, as it is the only *Bibliography* in the field, apart from Thangaswami Sarma's three volumes in Sanskrit on *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, *Advaita Vedānta* and *Mīmāṃsā*, one is thankful that there is at least such a *Bibliography*, for anyone who is seriously interested in information about the works in Indian philosophy till today cannot but rush to it for information as there is practically nothing else in the field up till now.

APPENDIX I

Some Representative Examples of the Changes in Dates
in the Third Edition of Potter's *Bibliography*

	Third Edition	Second Edition
Guṇamati	AD 500	AD 480
Dignāga	AD 510	AD 480
Ārya Vimuktisena	AD 560	AD 555
(Bhaṭṭa) Kallatta	AD 850	AD 854
Murāri Bhaṭṭa	AD 1645	AD 1670
Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa	AD 1593	AD 1600
Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana	AD 1620	AD 1630
Gauḍa Brahmānanda Saraswati	AD 1700	AD 1680
Rāmarudra Tarkavagiśa Bhaṭṭācārya	AD 1670	AD 1680

APPENDIX II

Some Representative Examples of the Changes in Dates
in the Third Edition of Potter's *Bibliography*

	Third Edition	Second Edition
Kambala	AD 500	AD 750
Ānanda	AD 570	AD 800

Gurudeva (Viraśaiva)	AD 1600	AD 1905
Sampādaneya Siddhavira	AD 1600	AD 1905
Annayacārya	AD 1673	AD 1785
Devarāja	AD 1800	AD 1600

APPENDIX III

Some Examples of Authors Mentioned in the Second Edition
of the *Bibliography* Missing in the Third Edition

1. Cūlabhayā
2. Nāga or Nāgabodhi, author of *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśāsāstra* (another Nāgabodhi listed as DU 443 in new *Bibliography* is not the author of this work)
3. Upaśānta—Abhidharmahṛdayasūtra
4. Dharmaghoṣa Sūri
5. Ānandasvarūpa Bhaṭṭāraka
6. Meghānanda
7. Abhayaprada
8. Senanātha
9. Rādhā Mohan Gosvamin
10. Sundarajāmātr
11. Mahādeva Punatārṅkara
12. Lakṣmīnṛsiṅha Śāstrin
13. Brahmadeva Pandita
14. Ratnanātha Sūka
15. Kedāra Nātha Bhaktīvinoda Thakkura
16. Śrīdhara Pāthaka Svāmin
17. K.S. Varadācārya

APPENDIX IV

Some Examples of Works of Unknown Authors Mentioned
in the Second Edition of the *Bibliography* but Missing
from the Third Edition

1. Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra
2. Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra
3. Avataṅśaka Sūtra
4. Prajñāpāramitahṛdayasūtra
5. Vṛtti on Iśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṃkhyakārikā
6. Ārya—Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra

APPENDIX V

Some Examples of Wrong Entries or Missing Entries
in Potter's New *Bibliography*

1. Entry 16 followed by entry 18.1.10. Entries 17 and 18 missing on pp. 50-51.
2. Mahākātyāyana (150 BC) listed in Index missing from *Bibliography*.
3. Vasumitra is listed in Index as 27, but entry 27 is missing in *Bibliography* p. 73-74.
4. (Sri) Kumāradeva is listed in Index as 609, in the *Bibliography* 609 is Bhajadeva.
5. Vasunandin Saiddhāntika is listed in Index as 665 but in *Bibliography* 665 is Bodhanidhi.

6. Vādhūla Virarāghavācārya is listed in Index as 702 but in *Bibliography* entry 702 is missing (p. 441).
7. Vijnānātman is listed in Index as 770 but in *Bibliography* 770 is Jinasena.
8. Narendrapuri is listed in Index as 778 but in *Bibliography* this entry is missing (p. 483).
9. In Index 810 is Devendra Sūri but in *Bibliography* it is Vateśvara.
10. In Index 727A is Varavaramuni. This entry is missing from *Bibliography* (p. 449). However there is another Varavaramuni listed as entry 1436 but in *Bibliography* 1436 is Kṛṣṇa Dhūrjaṭi Diksita in *Bibliography*.
11. Viśveśvara Pāndeya is listed in Index as 1164 but in *Bibliography* it is Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa.
12. Annayācārya is listed in Index as 1454 but in *Bibliography* it is Nityamukta Narahari. 1454 is missing.
13. Ananta Bhaṭṭa is listed in Index as 1138 but in *Bibliography* it is Purṇānandaśramin. One Ananta Bhaṭṭa is no. 1139 of *Bibliography*.
14. Gopinātha Maunin is listed as 1365 in Index but this entry is missing from *Bibliography* (p. 706).
15. Kākārāma is listed in Index as 1535 but in the *Bibliography* 1535 is Kiriti Venkaṭācārya.
16. Entry 1365 is missing.

The data in the Appendices has been prepared by Dr Rashmi Patni, Associate Professor, Department of History, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

Book Reviews

N.K. DEVARAJA, *The Limits of Disagreement: An Essay on Reasoning in Humanist Disciplines*, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, 1993, x+221 page Rs 200.

The proper role and strength of reasoning in humanistic disciplines has yet to achieve its full significance. Covering a wide range of contemporary philosophical issues, the author reaffirms his faith in creative humanism. The genesis of the thesis of creative humanism could be traced back to his D.Litt. dissertation submitted at Lucknow University in the year 1956, the revised and reduced version of which has been published as *The Philosophy of Culture: An Introduction to Creative Humanism* (1993). In this book, he has addressed two problems—how to restore the modern man's faith in the objectivity and universality of values and how to achieve a connected consciousness of the different kinds of values with the pursuit of which civilized human beings have been and ought to be concerned.

The author says that no justice can be done to the present book by a reviewer unless he or she studies his favourite book: *Freedom, Creativity and Value* (1988). In this book, he says that the specific essence of man consists in his urge towards creative pursuit of values. Having secured the means of subsistence, man finds it possible to withdraw this attention though temporarily, from the utilitarian aspects of life and the world around to occupy himself with only those phases of them which generate intrinsically significant forms of consciousness. This process may be called 'the process of evaluative abstraction' which man practises in the moment of leisure.

The 'Introduction' to the book deals with the conceptual framework of the entire presentation. The new wave of relativism and historicism, flourishing under the twin wings of 'hermeneutics' and 'sociology of knowledge' that seem to have invaded the cultural and the physical sciences alike come for extensive treatment and discussion. Logic is not the only form of rationality and scientific knowledge is not the only form of knowledge. There can be n-number of dimensions to rationality and 'knowledge'. Here the author examines the views of Giambattista Vico, the writer of *New Science* (1974), as interpreted by Wilhelm Dilthey on the one side and Hans-Georg Gadamer on the other. We can have a true understanding 'only of the world of history' (and not of nature) because in history we can comprehend what man has made himself. Only here, according to Vico, do truth and fact (*verum et factum*) coincide. This understanding happens to be the most perfect knowledge that is attainable for us human beings. According to the author, this understanding is the mode of knowing characteristic of human studies, viz. the human sciences.