What is the Future of Indian Philosophy?

JIŘÍ HOLBA
Oriental Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic (holba@orient.cas.cz)

ed. Purushottama Bilimoria with Amy Rayner. *History of Indian Philosophy*. Series: Routledge History of World Philosophies. London: Routledge, 2017, pp. 612.

The History of Indian Philosophy *(HIP) consists of fifty-eight chapters, written by specialists across a diverse range of general and particularized topics on Indic philosophical traditions. The editorial credit for this extensive volume also belongs to a number of associate editors, including Amy Rayner, John Powers, Christopher Chapple, Stephen Phillips, and Richard King.[1] There is, however, a shift evident in the methodological approach of this volume as compared to earlier orientalist and historical accounts. As Bilimoria notes in his preface, the editors have endeavored not only "to bring out the historical development of philosophical ideas within particular schools or against other critical systems, but also ... their interaction with broader cultural, social and paradigm shifts within Indian civilization that may have influenced or thwarted the optimal achievement in the area" (xxv).*

Keywords: Indian philosophy; Hindu philosophy; Buddhist philosophy; Jain philosophy; cross-cultural philosophy; historiography

The fifty-eight chapters of *The History of Indian Philosophy* (*HIP*) are organized into three sections: (1) knowledge, context, concepts, (2) philosophical traditions, and (3) engaging and encounters: modern and postmodern. Each part is "self-explanatory and marks in the most general terms not so much the chronology but rather the heterogeneous developments that could be classed as clusters of school or systems of thought (Brāhmanic, Buddhist, Jaina, Sikh, etc.)" (xxiv).

The first chapter ("Interpretations or Interventions? Indian philosophy in the Global Cosmopolis"), by Christian Coseru, is as "a concise overview of the volume, elucidating in a comparative frame certain key philosophical problems that have concerned and continue to engage Indian thinkers" (11). This chapter is a helpful introduction for all readers, including beginners to the field, who are interested in Indian philosophy. On Coseru's account, western philosophy commenced with wonder about the universe and the place of humanity within it, while philosophy in India began with various speculations and reflections about the nature, functioning, and meaning of language (11). It is remarkable that inquiry into the meaning of language (*padārtha*), one of the key questions of analytic philosophy in the twentieth century, was developed as a discipline in India by the second century, i.e., roughly 1800 years before Gottlob Frege, a key figure in the emergence of analytic philosophy. I am certainly in agreement with Coseru's view that increased knowledge of Indian philosophy will help us to better understand the ontological problem of "what there is," as well as the role of reason in contemporary philosophy. If this does come about, as we hope, then the study of Indian philosophy should concern its methods, views, arguments, etc.

Chapter 2, written by Nirmalya N. Chakraborty, deals with the methodology of classical Indian philosophy that germinates from methods of argumentation, sources of knowledge, and different forms of debate, which are evidenced in foundational texts. The interpretation of the Vedic texts played a very important role because they often formed the background of the

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

debate. Therefore Indian philosophers formulated different hermeneutic methods to correctly understand the Vedic sentences.

Chapter 3, written by Purushottama Bilimoria, focuses on *pramāṇa* ("measurement"), or sources of knowledge, an issue that played a crucial role in Indian epistemology. The *pramāṇa* system has origins in Indian medical literature, particularly in attempts at determining the etiology of an illness. While the status of numerous *pramāṇas* are debated across Indic traditions, nearly all schools accepted perception (*pratyakṣa*) and logical inference (*anumāna*). In chapter 9, Monima Chadha discusses perception in relation to contents of consciousness. According to Chadha, the terrain can be mapped in terms of three main philosophical trends: *direct realism* (Nyāya, Sāṃkhya, Mīmāṃsā, and early Buddhist school Vaibhāśika), *representationalism* (Sautrāntika Buddhism), and *phenomenalism* (Yogācāra Buddhism). Chadha points out that Indian schools debated controversial problems linked to perception in ways that parallel questions posed in western epistemology: Is all perception conceptual (Nyāya position) or non-conceptual (Buddhist position)? Is the content of consciousness "restricted to individual or are universals and relations also perceived? How do we differentiate veridical perception from illusions and hallucinations" (91)?

Issues pertaining to the real nature of the self (*ātman*) have been a key point of inquiry for Indian thinkers since the Vedic period. Michael Levine (chapter 8) proposes an interesting but regrettably short interpretation of responses to these issues. He is critical of the attempts of some contemporary philosophers (e.g., O. Flanagan, J. Ganeri, and M. Siderits) to naturalize Indian and Buddhist philosophy (88).

Part Two, "Philosophical traditions," is the largest portion of the volume and is divided into three sections. It starts with the chapters on the philosophy of the Brāhmaṇas, Vedic texts on sacrificial rituals, and the Upaniṣads, which are "wholly built on the foundation of the Brāhmaṇas" (118) and are key for understanding the beginnings of Indian philosophy. Brian Black (chapter 12) probes into whether or not the Upaniṣads are philosophy or just its preliminary phase. According to Herman Tull (chapter 11), we can indeed speak about philosophy even in the case of the Brāhmaṇas because their authors were "deeply engaged by metaphysical inquiry" and by the basic philosophical question "how is a thing known?" (115).

The next two chapters are on Sāṃkhya, one of the oldest Indian traditions, which significantly influenced narratives, religion, and philosophy in India. Mikel Burley (chapter 13) examines the teaching of its earliest treatise, i.e., the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (c. 350–450 CE), with particular attention to the ontological dualism posited in the *kārikā*s between the creative source (*prakṛti*) and the self (*puruṣa*), the doctrine of pre-existent effect (*satkāryavāda*), as well as soteriology, which consists of the liberation of the "self." Chapter 14, written by Knut Jacobsen, on the other hand, discusses the plurality of Sāṃkhya traditions and their differing accounts on the nature of time (*kāla*).

In chapter 15, Elisa Freschi addresses Mīmāṃsā, another classical school of Indian philosophy, which focuses on the exegesis of the Veda. As the foundational work of the tradition, Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* (first century CE) details exegetical rules for the systematic interpretation of the Vedas. Freschi writes, "These hermeneutic efforts led Mīmāṃsā authors to the investigation of linguistic, epistemological, exegetical, and deontic issues" (148). Indeed, Mīmāṃsākas explored the relation between a word and its meaning and reflected on the nature of prescriptive statements "long before this field of logic had been developed in Europe" (154).

Chapter 16, written by ShashiPrabha Kumar, engages with the ontological categories of the Vaiśeṣika school, which had a significant influence on other traditions, especially Nyāya. Chapter 17 (Stephen Philips) considers Naiyāyika theories of knowledge, cognition, and causality. Chapter 18 (J. L. Shaw) is focused on Nyāya's concept of inference (*anumāna*) and the distinction

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

between valid and invalid inference. Positioning Nyāya's philosophy of consciousness within experiential, analytical, and causal approaches, D. Berger argues in chapter 19 that Nyāya is illuminating for contemporary philosophy of mind even if it is not possible to characterize it in the modern western terms of dualism, reductionism, or emergentism. In chapter 20, Ram-Prasad Chakravarthi offers a phenomenological reading of the Nyāya critique of the concept of no-self (*anātman*) postulated by Buddhists. He examines Udayana's argument in the *Ātmatattvaviveka* about the phenomenal separateness of self. This position, which is leveled against the Buddhists, holds that "without a unitary locus of consciousness capable of reflexively using the first-personal 'I' diachronically across states of consciousness, the undeniable distinction between subjects that is available in experience would be inexplicable" (204). Chapter 21, written by Taisei Shida, is also focused on Udayana, specifically the theory of the extrinsic validity employed in his theistic monograph *Nyāyakusumāñjali*, which aims at rationally proving the existence of God.

Chapters 22–25 discuss the philosophy of the well-known tradition of Vedānta. Philosophers of Vedānta, "the end (*anta*) of the Vedas," are particularly concerned with setting forth a systematic interpretation of the Upaniṣads that coheres with varied theological-philosophical understandings of Brahman, the ultimate reality. In chapter 22, which addresses early Vedānta, Andrew Nicholson summaries the teachings of the *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa (c. 400–450 BCE); the *Vākyapadīya* (*On Sentences and Words*) by Bhartṛhari (c. late fifth century CE), the sophisticated linguistic philosopher; and the *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*, which is a commentary on *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* by Gauḍapāda (seventh century CE). The three aforementioned texts were important for the development of later vedāntic schools.

Chapter 23, written by Thomas Forsthoefel, discusses the philosophical context of the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara (c. eighth century), who, advancing on the work of Gauḍapāda, systematized a rigorous non-dualist reading of the foundational, scriptural sources of the Vedānta. Śaṅkara, notably, has received considerable attention over the last century, particularly by thinkers interested in metaphysics and comparative philosophy. Forsthoefel similarly positions the work of Śaṅkara as a "contribution to intellectual heritage of humankind, on par with classical Greek thinkers, Thomas Aquinas in Christian world, and Muslim philosophers such as Al-Ghazzali" (234).

Stephen Kaplan (chapter 24) addresses the conundrum of *avidyā* (ignorance), the source of rebirth, which seems to be the problem for unqualified, strong non-dualism of Advaita Vedānta: "If ātman/Brahman is this self-illuminating, partless, unchanging, non-dual, Being and Consciousness, how does duality with its parts and changes appear?" (243). Kaplan presents a series of questions and shows that this problem becomes the hard ontological problem for Advaita. Moving on from Advaita, chapter 25, written by Christopher Bartley, addresses the Viṣiṣṭādvaita ("qualified identity") Vedānta, which is a theistic Vaiṣṇava school. The key systematizer of this tradition, Rāmānuja (traditional dates: 1017–1137), who often challenged the non-dualistic doctrines of Advaita Vedānta, argues in the *Śrībhāṣyam* that "the 'I' that thinks, intends and acts is the real self. The pronoun 'I' ultimately stands for the inner self that is itself ensouled by God, its inner guide and sustainer" (257). Rāmānuja here levels a strong criticism against Śaṅkara's non-dualist stance. Other theistic philosophers have rigorously challenged Vedāntic non-dualism, including the exponents of the Mādhva Vedānta tradition as well as followers of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism, neither of which are discussed in this volume.

The last two chapters of Part 2a detail aspects of the Patañjali Yoga tradition. In chapter 26, Ana Funes positions classical Yoga philosophy as a philosophy of embodied self-awareness, arguing "that there is a non-reductionist conception of embodiment and a multilayered process of self-awareness implicit in the possibility of such 'yogic perception'" (264). Ian Whicher, in chapter 27, argues that Yoga is not in any case some "isolationistic" system leading to the "renunciation and abandonment of 'material existence,'" but a "responsible engagement" with

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

the world, which culminates in "an integrated and embodied state of liberated, yet engaged selfhood (*jīvanmukti*)" (271).

Chapters in Part 2b are focused on aspects of Buddhist philosophy. In chapter 28, W. Waldron provides a historical account of the Yogācāra ("Practitioners of Yoga") tradition, which developed in India from the third to fifth centuries CE. After the decline of Buddhism in India, around the twelfth century, Yogācāra was influential in China, Korea, and Japan. The tradition of Yogācāra, also known as Cittamātra ("consciousness-only"), is well-known for analyses of the processes of "consciousness" (*citta*) or cognitive awareness (*vijñāna*) of mind. "But what exactly 'consciousness' or 'mind' means was, and is, hotly debated" (283). While Yogācāra has been mostly interpreted "as a thoroughgoing idealism, which posits mind as a substantial reality" (283), Waldron argues that Yogācāra is not an idealistic ontology because "the dependent arising of cognition (*vijñapti*) involves constructive, interactional processes, not independent, substantive objects or *subjects*" (284).

In chapter 29, Peter Gilks discusses early Mahāyāna, one of the most significant forms of Buddhism. Scanty historical evidence has led to many different theories regarding the origins of the Mahāyāna movement. As the eminent scholar Gregory Schopen once noted, there is "constant discussion but little proof" regarding Indian Buddhist doctrinal history (Schopen 1985: 9).[2] In general, early Mahāyāna is often regarded as "a minority movement within, or at the fringes of, various Mainstream monastic institutions" (293). But this view raises the thought-provoking question as to why Mahāyāna was eventually so successful if it was a minority tradition for five hundred years (293). Even if the path of Mahāyāna was extremely long and difficult, many Indian Buddhists did indeed accept its soteriological framework. "Mahāyānists justified the authority of the new sūtras to themselves and others through the creation of a new episteme in which the Buddha's wisdom become invested with a transcendent timelessness that was accessible to anyone with the right training" (298). It is worth drawing attention here to the recently published anthology *Setting Out on the Great Way*, which provides the latest theories and manuscript evidence on the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism.[3]

Chapter 30, written by Joseph Walser, concerns the Abhidharma tradition, which developed during the first centuries after the death of the Buddha. Abhidharma summarized, systematized, and interpreted key points of the Buddha's teachings. Abhidharma writers were also "responsible for important developments in Buddhist taxonomy, ontology and soteriology" (306). These developments especially concerned the status and concept of the so-called *dharma*s, i.e., the psycho-physical events that constitute reality, including human beings. The Abhidharma project was crucially important because it served as the core of all later Buddhist philosophy, particularly the two most influential schools of the Mahāyāna: Yogācāra and Madhyamaka.

The last four chapters of Part 2b address Madhyamaka philosophy. In chapter 31, Jay L. Garfield writes on the tradition's "founder" Nāgārjuna (c. second century CE), one of the most important and influential Indian philosophers. Garfield concentrates on Nāgārjuna's life, views, context, and corpus. In addition to his well-known philosophical treatises, Garfield also discusses the influential hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna as well as works addressed to lay people. Garfield notes that the subtle, but important, reinterpretation of early Buddhist doctrines, such as the impermanence (*anitya*) of all existence, the absence of self (*anātman*), and the dependent origination of all phenomena, is "central to Nāgārjuna's philosophical outlook" (312). According to Nāgārjuna's account of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), indicated, for example, in his *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 24.18, all things are empty (*śūnya*) of their *essence* or *intrinsic nature* (*svabhāva*) because they are dependently originated (*pratītya-samutpāda*) or are merely dependent designations (*prajñaptir-upādāya*) (314).

In chapter 32, Douglas L. Berger points out that some scholars, such as Robert Magliola (*Derrida*, *On the Mend*, 1984), "have debated the merits of Derridian or deconstructionist reading of Nāgārjuna's thought" (326). Berger likewise sees some affinities between Derrida and

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

Nāgārjuna, such as their shared "anti-metaphysical stances" (327). Drawing on Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (*Fundamental Verses on the Middle Way*), Berger contextualizes Nāgārjuna's philosophy in relation to Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivāda Buddhist schools. He argues that Nāgārjuna's doctrine of emptiness reasserted the interdependence of phenomena and persons, suffering (*duḥkha*) and awakening (*bodhi*), *nirvāna* and *saṃsāra* (325–26). On Berger's contextualizing account, Nāgārjuna can be understood as "deconstructionist" who, not unlike Jacques Derrida, rejects metaphysical essentialism and follows the conventions and relations of the world. Space here prevents a critical engagement with this philosophically interesting deconstructionist reading of Nāgārjuna, but it suffices to say that there are many enigmas with Nāgārjuna's *Madhyamaka*. As David Ruegg pointed out nearly forty years ago, the philosophy of Nāgārjuna "has been variously described as nihilism, monism, irrationalism, misology, agnosticism, skepticism, criticism, dialectic, mysticism, acosmism, absolutism, relativism, nominalism, and linguistic analysis with therapeutic value" (Ruegg 1981: 2).[4] And since Ruegg, "other -isms, such as deconstructivism, dialetheism, and ontological non-foundationalism, have enlarged the menu of interpretative options even further."[5]

Two further chapters engage with Madhyamaka philosophy, both of which are written by Tibetan scholar Sonam Thakchoe. Chapter 34 addresses the conception of reality put forth by the Indian Buddhist master Bhāvaviveka (c. 500–578 CE). According to his metaphysical view, all phenomena, i.e., all external and internal entities (*dharmas*), "are established as intrinsic realities from the perspective of the non-analytical cognitions of the naïve ordinary beings." However, from the ultimate standpoint, "all phenomena, with the exception to the emptiness which is ultimately real, are intrinsically unreal (*niḥsvabhāvataḥ*) or ultimately unreal because they are established as empty of any intrinsic reality from the perspective of analytical exalted cognition (i.e., ultimate cognition of *ārya*-beings)" (344–45).

In chapter 35, Thakchoe turns attention to Bhāvaviveka's follower Jñānagarbha (eighth century) and his articulation of two truths: "(1) Conventional truth is that which appears to be real, while ultimate truth is the emptiness (*śūnyatā*) of that which appears. (2) Conventional truth is deceptive and contradictory, while ultimate truth is neither deceptive nor contradictory (*avisaṃvāda*). (3) Conventional truth cannot be analyzed since it does not withstand deductive reasoning, while ultimate truth can be analyzed since it does" (357).

In chapter 33, Alex Watson distinguishes and explicates the metaphysical positions of Nyāya, Śaiva Siddhānta, Mīmāṃsā, Jainism, and Buddhism on the existence or non-existence of a self (*ātman*).[6] Chapter 36, the last chapter of Part 2b, written by Joseph Loizzo and edited by Amy Rayner, engages with Vajrayāna (the "thunderbolt" vehicle), also known as Tantric Buddhism. Contrary to some views that characterize Vajrayāna as esoteric or secret or as a "fossilized curiosity," Loizzo positions the tradition "as a living paradigm of contemplative science and civilization" (360). Enlightenment in Vajrayāna necessitates ritual initiation from an enlightened spiritual master (*vajrācārya*), and involves the powerful world of circular diagrams (*maṇḍala*), enlightening speech (*mantra*), and hand gestures (*mudrā*) (361). The tantric path to Buddhahood entails creative and integrative practices, which lead to the perfected stage of clear light or illumination (368).

A welcomed addition to Part 2b would have been a chapter focused on the Buddhist teaching of *tathāgatagarbha* ("womb/embryo of the *tathāgata*s"), a key issue for numerous important Indian Mahāyāna *sūtra*s and *śāstra*s, such as the *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*, the *Śrīmālādevīsiṃhanādasūtra,* the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra,* the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, etc.

Chapters in Part 2c address the following themes: chapter 37, "Hermeneutics: Hindu, Buddhist, and Jaina" (Arthur Dudney); chapter 38, "Basic Jaina epistemology" (Jayandra Soni); chapter 39, "Anekāntavāda, Nayavāda, and Syādvāda: the history and significance of the Jaina doctrines of relativity" (Jeffery D. Long); chapter 40, "Jaina ethics and moral philosophy" (Christopher Key Chapple); chapter 41, "Tantra and Kashmiri Śaivism" (David Peter Lawrence);

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

chapter 42, "Looking beyond the Darśanas: Tantric knowledge systems and Indian philosophy" (Jason Schwartz); chapter 43, "The epistemology of classical Hindu law" (Donald R. Davis, Jr.), chapter 44, "Abhinavagupta" (Loriliai Biernacki); chapter 45, "Cognition and language: Buddhist criticism of Bhartṛhari's thesis" (Toshiya Unebe); chapter 46, "*Alaṃkāraśāstra* as a philosophical discipline (David Mellins)[7]; chapter 47, "Indian philosophy of music" (William J. Jackson).

As evident by the aforementioned titles, this section of *HIP* is refreshingly strong on the Jaina and, to some degree, Śaiva traditions, which have been underemphasized in earlier renditions of Indian philosophy. Further, the present volume on the whole pushes beyond an essentialized *darśana*s approach of the classical *saṃgraha*s, or doxographies, by including, for example, *alaṃkāraśāstra*, *dharmaśāstra*, and even musicology, inviting the reader to see "philosophy" outside of merely debate, logic, and dialectics.

The last part of *HIP* is called "Engaging and encounters: modern and postmodern." Chapter 48, written Muhammad Kamal, investigates the influence of Islamic modernity in the Indian subcontinent. The chapter expounds on the way in which some modernist Muslim thinkers understand nature and history with reference to the Qur'an, rationality, and scientific knowledge, while also detailing critiques of predestination. One is left to hope that this movement will move beyond merely a "circle of Muslim intellectuals" and that it will also permeate "academic boundaries" (486).

In chapter 49, Balbinder Singh Bhogal examines the question of how to rethink or re-valuate Sikh *dharam* (or *dharma*), which was revealed to the Sikhs by the Word (*shabab*) of their Gurus (*gur*). He addresses this problem in view of the transformation of "pre-colonial" *sikhi* to contemporary "colonial/modern" Sikhism. To emphasize this revaluation Bhogal employs here a "third term *sikhi(sm)* as a postcolonial strategy to foreground the legacy of powerful colonial inscriptions, to recall how colonial power continually affects the production of modern knowledge" (487). This chapter, which addresses a theme that occurs rarely in contemporary literature, offers a very useful contribution.

In chapter 50, Damien Keown explores two key concepts of Buddhist ethics: *dharma* and *karma*. Keown examines Buddhist precepts and virtues, such as generosity (*dāna*), non-violence (*ahiṃsā*), and compassion (*karuṇā*), which played an important role in Mahāyāna Buddhism. Keown also refers to the doctrine of skillful means (*upāya-kauśalya*), Tantra and Buddhist ethics in the west. "Socially engaged Buddhism," an influential part of Asian and western Buddhism, which is founded on the values of compassion, loving-kindness (*mettā*), generosity, and non-violence, is also briefly mentioned. This stream of Buddhist tradition seeks nonviolent means of solving contemporary social, economic, political, cultural, and ecological challenges.[8]

Chapter 51, written by the late Peter Paul Kakol and edited by Amy Rayner, integrates Madhyamaka Buddhism with Process Philosophy. Kakol argued that this creative and complementary integration could "contribute to (1) Mādhyamika-Process dialogue and interreligious dialogue in general; (2) evaluative worldview analysis and a general theory of worldviews; (3) ethical theory (disinterested compassion, middle way ethics, and gradation of value); and (4) socio-political theory (social engagement based on asymmetrical interdependence between individuals and society, the liberal–communitarian debate)" (514). Adapting Charles Hartshorne's position,[9] P. Kakol writes that Process Buddhists can thus say: "Philosophers have only interpreted (*dṛṣṭi*) the world in various ways; the point is to experience it directly (*darśana*)" (506). On this account, Process Buddhism is "a liberating praxis which combines meditation and philosophy in psychophysical direct experience of reality" (507).

In chapter 52, Thomas B. Ellis discusses the encounter between India and Europe in the colonial and postcolonial phases, which had "three successive, yet overlapping stages, that is, enthusiasm, chauvinism, and patience" (517). Chapter 53, written by A. Raghuramaraju, contains

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

some comparison of contemporary Indian philosophy with modern western philosophy. In chapter 54, Bindu Puri rejects a relativist interpretation of Gandhi's project and argues that Gandhi accepted moral criticism as valuable and believed in objective moral truths.

A. Sjödin, in chapter 55, examines the issue of *darśana*, arguing that generalization, essentialization, and a universalized conceptualization of "Indian philosophy" have deeply hindered the understanding of classical Indian philosophy (549–51). Sjödin criticizes some of these tendencies exhibited by Krishna Daya, Jitendranath Mohanty, and Wilhelm Halbfass. Citing the concepts of *siddhānta* ("established conviction") and *pramāṇavāda* ("discussion of means of knowledge") from the *Nyāyasūtra* and its commentaries, Sjödin argues that philosophy in these texts means philosophical or knowledge discourse, i.e., discussing activity or discursive practice, rather than "doctrine-centered substance" (552).

The final three chapters take up modern developments in Indian philosophical thought, including S. Deshpande's chapter on G. R. Malkani, the former editor of the *Philosophical Quarterly*, who, like many other Indian thinkers of the twentieth century, philosophically engaged and adapted Advaita Vedānta.[10] In chapter 57, Carl Olson examines contemporary Indian engagements with postmodernism, particularly the work of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Homi K. Bhaba. In the last chapter of *HIP,* Jayanda Prabhu criticizes the Eurocentristic approach and marginalization of non-western philosophy by G. W. Hegel, E. Husserl, and H. G. Gadamer.[11] According to Prabhu, even Gadamer privileges "the West alone with having the normative concept of 'true philosophy'" (577). Prabhu hopes, as do I, that this Indiaesque postcolonial critique can create the space for philosophy as a discipline that is a cross-cultural, the universality of which is based on dialogue between equals.

At the end of *HIP* we find a useful *Glossary of Sanskrit Terms* with their English translation (580–599) and an *Index* (600–12). Also *Notes on Contributors* and *References* are helpful, even if some could have been more comprehensive. Readers may have also welcomed the abstracts of the chapters, which are only available on Routledge's website. Further, given the £165.00 cost of the volume, which makes university libraries the likely purchaser, the present reviewer was disappointed with the quality of Routledge's binding, which broke after little use.

I am quite sure that this excellent volume on Indian philosophy, which ranges from Vedic genres, through the classical philosophical systems, Buddhism, Jainism, Tantrism, Islam in India, modern philosophical thought, and so on, will become a standard reference work in the field, serving specialists and non-specialists alike. A number of the chapters are also cross-culturally informed philosophical engagements, which make plain the continued, even perennial, relevance and profundity of Indian philosophical thought. In doing so, *HIP* provides an outstanding resource for teachers who aim to globalize their philosophy courses by including Indian philosophy.[12]

Given the immensity of Indian philosophical literature, it is impossible for a single volume to cover all topics and traditions. Indeed, there could be an entire volume dedicated to modern Indian philosophy, let alone classical traditions, including those not discussed in *HIP*, such as the grammarians, etc. Perhaps, then, the rightful successor of this volume should be a multivolume project. What is clear, however, is that not unlike Aristotle or Edmund Husserl, whose works remain vibrant dialogue partners in philosophy classrooms today, the future of philosophy must move forward with attention to not only the western canon but also to the history of non-western traditions, particularly the *History of Indian Philosophy*.

Jiří Holba, PhD, is a researcher in the Department of South Asia at the Oriental Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. From 2002 until 2015, he was Assistant Professor in the Institute of Philosophy and Religious Studies at Charles University. Dr. Holba is the author of several

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11

publications, including a Czech translation of the *Diamond Sūtra* and a volume on Madhyamaka philosophy.

---

1 Richard King's *Indian Philosophy*: *An Introduction to Hindu and Buddhist Thought* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1999) was one of the first books on Indian philosophy to critically examine the Eurocentric approach to Indian thought.

2 Gregory Schopen, "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit," *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10, (1985): 9-47.

3 See *Setting out on the Great Way: Essays on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*, ed. Paul M. Harrison (Sheffield: Equinox Publishing, 2018).

4 David Ruegg, *The Literature of Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981).

5 Jan Westerhoff, *The Golden Age of Indian Buddhist Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 89.

6 Also on this issue, see *Hindu and Buddhist Ideas in Dialogue: Self and No-Self*, ed. Jonardon Ganeri, Irina Kuznetsova, Chakravarthi Ram-Prasad (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

7 It is a pity that in the title of this chapter, as well as in the "Contents," *alaṃkāraśāstra* is twice spelled incorrectly, and on page 457, we likewise find another unnecessary spelling mistake of the same term.

8 See Sallie B. King, *Socially Engaged Buddhism. Dimensions of Asian Spirituality* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009).

9 See Charles Hartshorne, "Some Comments on Randall Morris' Process Philosophy and Political Ideology," *Process Studies* 21, no. 3, (1992): 149–51. One should not confuse this with thesis eleven from Karl Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach*: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

10 Many engagements with Advaita during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries involved advaitic works that did not originate within the "Advaita Vedānta" of Śaṅkara and thus fall outside the *pramāṇa* system and other norms of vedāntic orthodoxy. See James Madaio, "Rethinking Neo-Vedānta: Swami Vivekananda and the Selective Historiography of Advaita Vedānta" *Religions* 8, no. 6, (2017): 101.

11 See Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Plato and Heidegger," in ed. Mervyn Sprung, *The Question of Being. East–West Perspectives* (University Park, PA and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978), 45–53.

12 One interesting proposal for how to integrate Indian philosophy into academic courses was put forth by the American philosopher Peter Adamson, who is the author of the website *A History of Philosophy Without Any Gaps*. He notes: "a non-specialist would need at least a summer to get ready for teaching a course on Buddhism, but might be able to do a session or two just on Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka Buddhism after an intense weekend of reading. The integration of these texts into syllabi would make an excellent addition to a course on skepticism: last week Sextus Empiricus, this week Nāgārjuna, next week al-Ghazali, followed by Nicholas of Autrecourt and then Descartes' *Meditations*" (see https://blog.apaonline.org/2018/09/03/so-you-want-to-teach-some-islamic-philosophy). I might add, for instance, the Indian materialistic skeptic Jayarāśi Bhaṭṭa (c. 800–840) to enrich this course even more.

Journal of World Philosophies 4 (Summer 2019): 177-184

e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: 10.2979/jourworlphil.4.1.11