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In the West the pursuits of poetry and philosophy have generally been viewed as antithetical. While we no doubt encounter the occasional philosophical poet, and poetic philosopher, the ancient and rigid dichotomy between the two domains has rarely been seriously challenged. Traditional Indian culture, by contrast, generously provides us with examples of those who excelled in both worlds, men like Dharmaśreya and Śrīharsa who composed keen-witted and often profound treatises on epistemology or logic, and at the same time wrote powerful and memorable love poetry.

In a way that is matched by few scholars in the recent history of Western Indology, Daniel Ingalls incarnates this traditional Indian spirit of the catholicity of humanistic studies. It is manifest in the record of his scholarly work as well as in the character and influence of his more than thirty years of teaching at Harvard University.

Born in New York City in 1916, and raised in Virginia, Daniel Ingalls studied classics as an undergraduate at Harvard, where teachers such as Rand and Pease strengthened an innate love for classical poetry—Horace in particular—that was to remain with him thenceforth, and invest his Indological studies with a special aesthetic sensitivity. He received his A.B. degree in 1936, and in the same year married his beloved wife, Phyllis Day Ingalls. He had begun his Sanskrit training in his undergraduate days under the learned Walter Eugene Clark. This he continued as a graduate student at Harvard (he also learned Chinese and Japanese), while concurrently beginning work in the area of mathematical logic under W. V. Quine, which was to deepen in later years. Here the project that would occupy him for much of the following decade took shape—the first rigorously philosophical description and analysis of the “New School” of Indian logic.

Upon the completion of his A.M. (1938), Ingalls was awarded a prestigious Junior Fellowship (1939–42, 1946–49), and travelled to India, out of the conviction he later instilled in his students, that exposure to the still-living tradition of Sanskrit learning in India is a necessary condition for mastery of the subject. The years 1939–41 were spent in Calcutta, where he studied under the brilliant logician, MM. Śrī Kālpada Tarkāchārya. (He would return on a number of occasions to India, Pune in particular, where he consulted frequently with one of the most respected of contemporary traditional scholars, Jain Muni Jambūvijaya.) After the outbreak of the War, Ingalls was assigned to the Office of Strategic Services, engaged first in decoding Japanese radio messages. Later he was posted to Afghanistan, where, while teaching geometry in the Farsi medium to the sons of the princely class, he performed further work of a sensitive nature. He was discharged from the U.S. army in 1946, having risen to the rank of Captain. Returning then to Harvard he resumed his Junior Fellowship, and in 1949 he was appointed assistant professor in the Department of Indic Philology (later renamed at his urging the Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies). In 1950 he became chairman, in 1954 associate professor, and in 1958 he was named Wales Professor of Sanskrit, a position he held until his retirement in 1983.

tance of this work lies not only in its attempt to provide a competent and trustworthy description and analysis of an extraordinary intellectual achievement previously all but ignored by Western scholars. It is significant also for the high seriousness with which it treats the topic, and—a consequence of this attitude—for its demonstrating that it is possible, indeed necessary to bring to bear on Indian thought the most rigorous and exacting modes of contemporary philosophical discourse. Prior to the appearance of *Materials*, Indian philosophy had been studied either as a more or less dead letter—an artifact or relic of the Indian past, possessing principally an antiquarian significance; or as an ingredient in some *philosophia perennis*, that murky and rather thin metaphysical soup. Ingalls’ book sought to demonstrate that Indian philosophy not only can be as careful and precise as Western analytic philosophy but in fact may well have something of vital importance to teach it. A whole generation of scholars has learned this critical lesson, and consequently the very enterprise of studying Indian philosophy has, in some ways radically, been altered.

Ingalls followed up his work on Indian logic with a wide range of significant Indological contributions. Particularly noteworthy are: “Sāṅkara on the Question: Whose is Avidyā.” *Philosophy East and West* 3 (1953); “Sāṅkara’s Arguments Against the Buddhists.” *idem* (1954); “Authority and Law in Ancient India.” *JAOS* Supplement No. 17 (1954); “Human Effort Versus God’s Effort in the Early Nyāya (NS 4.1.19–21),” S. K. Belvalkar Felicitation Volume (Banaras, 1957); “Cynics and Pāñcupatas: The Seeking of Dishonor,” *Harvard Theological Review* 55 (1962). At the same time that these philosophical and religious-historical essays were being produced, Ingalls was engaged on the next major project of his career, the annotated translation of *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: Vidyākara’s “Subhāṣitaratnakosa”* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965; Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 44; an abridged version, with revised introduction, appeared in 1968 under the title *Sanskrit Poetry from Vidyākara’s “Treasury”*). Initially, his intention was to provide only a commentary on the text-volume edited by Kosambi and Gokhale. Fortunately, this plan was soon abandoned, and it was decided instead to offer a complete translation of the nearly two thousand poems in the *Kosa*.

Once more, Ingalls produced a work that had few precedents. It was again exceptional in the Western tradition of Indology for the seriousness with which it considered the literary achievement of ancient India. And again it was informed by a combination of talents hitherto virtually unknown in the field: an authoritative command of Sanskrit and the sometimes obscure conventions of court poetry, and an impeccable sense of English idiom and the possibilities of literary translation. In addition, the notes and chapter prefaces are themselves an important contribution to Sanskrit literary studies, while the substantial introduction is probably the most perceptive and well-balanced account of Sanskrit poetry and rhetoric in the English language. Widely anthologized and continuously in print since first published, Ingalls’ versions of the *Subhāṣitaratnakosa* remain in the view of many the most trustworthy testimony to non-Sanskritists of how very beautiful the literature can be.


In each of these essays one can rediscover the qualities that have marked Ingalls’ work from the beginning: a conviction that the essential problematic of any literary study ought by preference to be suggested by the texts themselves, and not imposed by any external theory; an integrity and honesty toward the materials, which insist that our reading into a text must be subordinated as far as possible to our reading out what is there; a punctilious scholarship that recognizes sound philology as its essential precondition; a profound respect for Indian culture, and a firm conviction that its contributions are major achievements of the human spirit with an abiding meaningfulness for us; a respect, too, for the Sanskrit tradition of exegesis and traditional categories of analysis, without a knowledge of which we cannot hope to understand the character and function of the culture (though this is not blind respect, but rather is tempered by the awareness that no tradition is altogether competent to explain itself); and perhaps most engagingly, that rare and genial humanism, which makes his scholarship a source at once of knowledge and delight.

There are other aspects of Daniel Ingalls’ career that appear on no bibliography, in no *Who’s Who*, but are easily as important as his rich publication record. By his scholarly example Professor Ingalls has
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been for many of his students the single most important teacher and inspiration in their lives. The desirability of a totalizing approach to traditional India evinced in his research was brought into the classroom as well, where, in his alternating courses in philosophy and literature that have become requirements for the advanced degree in Sanskrit and Indian Studies at Harvard, he would demonstrate a magisterial command of the entire range of Indological studies. The number of students that came to work with him from around the world gives testimony to his exceptional learning and gifts as a teacher; many of these students have gone on to occupy important Indological posts in universities in the United States, Canada, England, Australia, Japan, and India. Under his editorship, the Harvard Oriental Series has been enriched by seven volumes (with several more about to go to press, including a three-volume annotated translation of the masterwork of Indian aesthetics, the Dhvanyāloka and Locana, a collaborative effort on the part of Ingalls, J. M. Masson, and M. V. Patwardhan). All of these volumes have been edited with the vast care and expertise that have characterized this series since its inception nearly a century ago. Another accomplishment, which, given his innovative approach to Indian studies, is not so anomalous as it may at first appear to be, is that Professor Ingalls has recently been working in the forefront of computer applications to Sanskrit: One of his current projects is a computer-assisted analysis of the formulaic diction of the Sanskrit epic, which promises soon to bear important fruit. Finally, mention should be made of his considerable administrative skills, put to effective use in his years on the board of Trustees of the Harvard Yenching Institute, and on numerous national scholarly committees. He has also served as President of the American Oriental Society (1958).

Sarvatantrasvatana is one term used in India to describe such rare men as Daniel Ingalls. By his intellectual accomplishments and his character, as teacher, scholar, and friend, he has won the deepest admiration and affection of his colleagues and students. They hope that, with this volume, they may express at least a portion of their feelings for him.