

Details: examples of cut-paste copying of previously published work without acknowledgment by George Joseph and Dennis Almeida

It is a bit farcical to reiterate detailed examples of the manifest cut-paste copying of Manchester 2007 from Trivandrum 2003 (published version of Trivandrum conference) and from Trivandrum 2000. However, it is interesting to make a comparison with earlier published works of mine to establish the fact of verbatim copying from previously published sources without due acknowledgment (irrespective of my authorship of Trivandrum 2000).

The Hawai'i paper was the first to be published in 2001. Though it focuses on epistemology, it also very much related to transmission of calculus. Thus, [section 4 of my Hawai'i paper is on the history of calculus](#). It first makes the point that Newton etc. did not understand the calculus. Then it makes the point that Western historians are untrustworthy and keep making wild claims about Greek achievements and transmission from the Greeks. It is in this context that it introduces the theme about a legal standard of evidence, using motivation, opportunity, and documentary and circumstantial evidence. Note that this is a general technique, and all these tests apply *a fortiori* to Almeida and Joseph as is being applied here.

Further, apart from the question of latitude, the Hawai'i paper summarizes the question of longitude, the circumstantial evidence of *ahargana* and Scaliger's Julian days, Fermat and "Pell's" equations etc. and indeed the entire substance of Trivandrum 2003. This would not be of any consequence if I were recognized as the undisputed author of Trivandrum 2000, and Trivandrum 2003. However, since Manchester 2007 is only a slightly different version of these two earlier papers, and in this paper as in various other plagiarised publications by Almeida and Joseph they have sought to deny my authorship we also need to take into account the following.

Now the simple point in this section is that the Hawai'i paper was already published as of 2001. The Trivandrum 2003 paper and the Manchester 2007 paper are published/publicised later. Therefore, copying verbatim without acknowledgment, *in each case of verbatim copying*, from the Hawai'i paper amounts to plagiarism. **Therefore, Almeida and Joseph need to be prosecuted for copyright violation and fraud both in India (by me), and Britain (by AHRC).**

For example, in the Hawai'i 2000 article, published in 2001 (but taking a note from the Yuktibahsa 1998 paper) note 59 reads

59. The key passage is quoted in the YuktiBhâsâ and attributed to the TantraSangraha. (Thampuran and Aiyar, *YuktiBhâsâ*, pt.1, p. 190). The passage is *not* to be found in the TantraSangraha of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. [Tantrasangraha, ed. S. K. Pillai, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 188 (Trivandrum, 1958)], the English translation of which has been recently serialised in the *Indian Journal of History of Science*. The authors of the modern YuktiBhâsâ commentary have however used a transcript of the MSS of the TantraSangrahaVyâkhyâ in the Desamangalattu Mana, a well-known Namboodri household. This version of the TantraSangraha is found in the TantraSangrahaVyâkhyâ, Palm Leaf MS No. 697 and its transcript No. T1251, both in the Kerala University MS Library, Trivandrum. The missing verses are after II.21a of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series MS. The same verses are also found on pp 68–69 of the transcript No. T-275 of the TantraSangrahaVyâkhyâ at Trippunitra Sanskrit College Library which is copied from the manuscript of the Desamangalattu

Mana. ... For detailed quotations and a more mathematical account of the passages, see C. K. Raju, "Approximation and proof in the Yuktibhasa derivation of Madhava's Sine series". Paper presented at the National Symposium on Applied Sciences in Sanskrit Literature: Various Aspects of Utility, Agra 20-22 Feb 1999.

This is copy pasted in both Trivandrum 2003 and Manchester 2007.

(Manchester 2007) 4. The version of the TantraSangraha which has been recently serialised (K. V. Sarma ed) together with its English translation (V. S. Narasimhan Tr.) in the Indian Journal of History of Science (issue starting Vol. 33, No. 1 of March 1998) is incomplete and does not contain the relevant passages. We have used the version of the TantraSangraha as found in the TantraSangrahaVyakhya, Palm Leaf MS No 697 and its transcript No. T 1251, both of the Kerala University MS Library, Trivandrum. The missing verses are after II.21a of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series MS. The same verses are also found on pp 68—69 of the transcript No., T-275 of the TantraSangrahaVyakhya at Trippunitra Sanskrit College Library, copied from a palm leaf manuscript of the Desa Mangalatta Mana. Mana. We found P1-697/T-1251 more useful since the commentary in Malayalam is clearly separated from the original text in Sanskrit. Needless to say these verses are also found in the YuktiBhasa etc.

The question is who is this "we"? Obviously someone capable of obtaining primary sources on palm leaf manuscripts, and capable of examining the mathematics and astronomy in them in Sanskrit and Malayalam. The mystery is clearly resolved in both Trivandrum 2000 and Trivandrum 2003 in which note 3 is an exact copy but adds the following.

For detailed quotations, translations, and a mathematical exposition collected in one place, see C. K. Raju, 'Approximation and proof in the Yuktibhasa derivation of Madhava's Sine series'. Paper presented at the National Symposium on Applied Sciences in Sanskrit Literature: Various Aspects of Utility, Agra 20-22 Feb 1999. To appear in Proceedings.

Clearly, the "we" very much included C. K. Raju and relies on his work. However, Manchester 2007 includes the name of Joseph as author. Joseph well knows he has copied a passage from this Yuktibhasa paper in the 2nd edition of his book without acknowledgment. Hence, he does not want to admit to having seen the paper. What is the solution? A quick lie as usual! So Joseph asks Almeida to delete the reference to the Yuktibhasa paper, and Almeida obliges. That this is what happened is proved from the fact that a reference to the Yuktibhasa paper survives in note 53 of the Manchester 2007 paper which refers to the Yuktibhasa paper, and adds "cited earlier"! Careless slip trips the fake authors and exposes the serial plagiarists and culture thieves!

Anyway, with the deletion of that key reference, the meaning of "we" has changed. It now refers only to the authors of the Manchester 2007 paper, and Almeida and Joseph have claimed its authorship. So, they also became experts in Sanskrit overnight! Can they even explain how they obtained the primary sources to which they refer? How did they understand them without knowing Sanskrit (or even mathematics and astronomy)?

Again consider the footnote 3 in (Trivandrum 2000, part 1) , and footnote 38 (Trivandrum 2000, part 2) copy-pasted as footnotes 4 and 79 of the Manchester (2007). Both relate to an unpublished typescript of the first English translation of the Yuktibhasa, personally handed over to me by the late K. V. Sarma whose home I visited for this purpose, and who had signed and agreed to contribute to my PHISPC volume. Can these two explain how they got the typescript? Can they explain how they understood this extremely difficult typescript, without any knowledge of Sanskrit or mathematics or astronomy? (It

took a team of three top Indian scholars to explain this in the version published by Springer.) The second of the above footnotes refers to a personal communication with K. V. Sarma. Do they have a record of that specific personal communication?

Further, these scheming authors of the stolen Manchester 2007 paper were aware of my presentation in a parallel conference in Hawai'i, in Jan 2000, as they themselves acknowledge. So each individual passage which was copied verbatim from an earlier published source should also have been acknowledged. Why wasn't this done?

Again, for example, to emphasize that the source of Clavius' sine values (which I examined in the Vatican library) were Indian, I put in the following footnote (footnote 32 in Hawai'i, and also footnote 21 in Trivandrum 2003, and identical footnote 28 in Manchester 2007) abbreviating the title of Clavius' book as

“Christophori Clavii Bambergensis, Tabulae Sinuum, Tangentium et Secantium ad partes radij 10,000,000 ..., Ioannis Albini, 1607.”

to show that he used the Indian definition of the sine by incorporating the value of the radius.

Again, footnote 27 in Hawai'i reads

The victory of algorismus over abacus was depicted by a smiling Boethius using Indian numerals, and a glum Pythagoras to whom the abacus technique was attributed. This picture first appeared in the *Margarita Philosophica* of Gregor Reisch, 1503, and is reproduced, for example, in Karl Menninger, *Number Words and Number Symbols: A Cultural History of Numbers*, trans. Paul Broneer, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1970, p. 350.

This is an editorially and stylistically corrected version of the note in Manchester 2007

The victory of algorismus over abacus was depicted by a smiling Boethius using Indian numerals, and a glum Pythagoras to whom the abacus technique was attributed. This picture first appeared in the *Margarita Philosophica* of Gregor Reisch, 1503, and is reproduced e.g. in Karl Menninger, *Number Words and Number Symbols: A Cultural History of Numbers*, (Tr) Paul Broneer, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1970, p 350. According to the periodisation suggested by Menso Folkerts, the abacus period commenced by the 12th century, though the use of the abacus is obviously much older. Menso Folkerts, Lecture at the Second Meeting of the International Laboratory for the History of Science, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin, 19-26 June 1999.

The last part of the note, refers to a lecture by Menso Folkerts, is a style of citation which could be possible (and relevant) only for me.

As a final example, consider the following. footnote on Kepler.

(Footnote 45 to chp. 5, of *The Eleven Pictures of Time*, Sage, 2003.)

‘Planet Fakery Exposed. Falsified Data: Johannes Kepler’. *The Times* (London) 25 January 1990, 31a. The article includes large excerpts from the article by William J. Broad, ‘After 400 Years, a Challenge

to Kepler: He Fabricated Data, Scholars Say', *New York Times*, 23 January 1990, C1, 6. The key background article is William Donahue, 'Kepler's Fabricated Figures: Covering Up the Mess in the New Astronomy', *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, **19**, 1988, p. 217–37.

This is virtually copy pasted as footnote 59 in Manchester 2007.

“Planet fakery exposed. Falsified data: Johannes Kepler” *The Times* (London) 25 January 1990, 31a, including large excerpts from the article by William J. Broad, “After 400 years, a challenge to Kepler: He fabricated his data, scholars say”. *New York Times* 23 January 1990, C1, 6. The key article is William Donahue, “Kepler’s fabricated figures: Covering up the mess in the New Astronomy” *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, **19** (1988) p 217-37.

Do either Almeida or Joseph know enough astronomy to be able to explain how Kepler did his calculations and whether they correspond to observations?

The examples of cut-paste above are merely representative, since an exhaustive account would be exhausting. The key point is that in each case it is easy to verify that the Manchester 2007 paper plagiarised heavily from earlier **published work of mine**.