Preface

THIS VOLUME presents a middle-of-the-road explanation of the fundamentals of the Indian mind as expressed in its great philosophies, religions, and social thought and practices. The essays which comprise this symposium, since they are technical in themselves and written by experts in their special areas, will meet the needs of the technical scholar. But they will also meet the needs of the educated reader generally, as well as the technical expert, because over-technical considerations have not been stressed except where necessary to avoid the sacrifice of fundamental accuracy and technical integrity.

The chapters in this volume are papers presented at the four East-West Philosophers' Conferences held at the University of Hawaii in 1939, 1949, 1959, and 1964.* Not all of the papers presented at these conferences are included here because of technical and publication limitations; among the papers not presented are a few of the extremely technical papers in specialized areas.

While this is essentially a reprint volume in the sense that all the papers have already been published, they have been re-edited by the editor and by the authors of the papers, except in the case of the paper by Professor Takakusu, who died in 1945.

* These volumes are: *Philosophy—East and West* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944); *Essays in East-West Philosophy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1951); *Philosophy and Culture—East and West* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1962); *The Status of the Individual in East and West* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967).

The order in which the papers are published herein does not correspond with the order of their presentation at the conferences, but has been determined in a more systematic manner regardless of the date of the original presentation. Following this Preface, there will be a more technical and yet general introductory treatment of the Indian view of the status and nature of philosophy as such. This is followed by papers dealing, in succession, with metaphysical matters; epistemological concerns; problems within the areas of ethical and social philosophy; special and particular problems in more restricted areas, such as religion, legal and political philosophy, etc.; and, finally, the status of the individual in Indian thought and culture. This last section of the book is a concentrated examination of this particular problem, which has always been of major importance in philosophy, in both East and West, but is of special importance in the contemporary world and therefore requires full and detailed consideration—partly also because it is the basis of so much misunderstanding all around.

One of the basic principles of the conferences at which these papers were presented was that the descriptions (and evaluations) of the various philosophical and cultural traditions of East and West should be entrusted to representatives of those traditions, so that listeners and readers could most closely approach the ideal of understanding other traditions as the people of those traditions understand themselves. This principle has been followed in this volume—as in the volume on China, and will be followed in the volume on Japan in this series—but, for special reasons, there are two exceptions here.

In order to do full justice to the very complicated developments of Buddhist philosophy, which originated in India, despite its less significant status there than the various systems and thinkers within the Hindu tradition, it was considered highly advisable to include here a paper which deals essentially with early Buddhism—the paper by Dr. G. P. Malalasekera—and a paper which deals with the more technical developments of Buddhist philosophy and with Buddhism in its specific relationship to the Hindu systems—the paper by Dr. Junjirō Takakusu. These authors are not Indians, to be sure, but the subject-matter with which their chapters deal is of basic importance in an over-all consideration of Indian philosophy, and it is felt that their chapters add materially to the soundness of the volume as a whole.

It is possible that this generally wise policy of having each

Asian tradition described by personal representatives rather than by "outside" scholars has led to somewhat more idealized presentations than might have been given by more "objective" Western experts. On the other hand, there is the thought that it is really more accurate to see a people—or even an individual person—in its best light, in terms of its ideals, because these do essentially constitute the mind of the given tradition. (The law of the land as written out in somewhat ideal form in constitutions and formal statute law, for example, is often said to constitute or express the real mind or character of a people or nation, but that does not mean that there are no law-breakers.) There is also the thought that "outside" experts are sometimes even more biased—one way or the other—than the representatives who, as the ones here do, combine personal knowledge of the tradition and sound scholarship.

Partly because of the technicalities of the subject-matter and the languages involved, and partly because the volume is a symposium to which outstanding scholars have contributed, the matter of detailed editing has been somewhat more difficult than it would have been in a different kind of volume. While general consistency and uniformity of basic style have been achieved, there are some variations in several aspects of style, because of the occasional adoption of common usage rather than of complete technical accuracy and also because some of the authors themselves strongly preferred different styles—and the editor respected these preferences.

For the careful—and possibly critical—reader it may be helpful to call attention to a few of the perhaps unusual styles involved, and some of the variations.

In general, hyphenation has been used abundantly, the purpose being to provide greater ease of reading on the part of the non-Indian reader who is not familiar with the technical and sometimes very long words, expressions, titles, etc., in Sanskrit and Pali (Pāli). This may irritate the technical expert, but it will unquestionably help the uninitiated and the general reader. At times, with admitted inconsistency, some expressions and titles are not hyphenated—because they are so well known.

Capitalization is always a problem in articles and books written by Asian authors, because most of them strongly prefer a much greater use of capitals than Westerners would in the same situation. In general, capitalization has been kept to something of a minimum, but not always, and in these latter cases the retention of capitals was out of respect for the wishes of the author or because of fear of

distortion of technical meanings that might have resulted from "outside" editing. (Reference is made especially to Professor Takakusu's chapter.) The matter of capitalization of some technical terms is of genuine significance. Generally speaking, in these cases the capital is used to refer to ultimates or metaphysical principles or realities, whereas the lower case is used for the empirical aspect referred to by the same term—as especially illustrated by *Nirvāṇa* and *nirvāṇa*—sometimes very difficult to distinguish—and *Ātman* and *ātman*.

Common usage is occasionally employed, usually involving the inconsistent use of the stem form and the nominative case—as, e.g., *karma* (not *karman*), *ātman* (not *ātma*), and *parva* (not *parvan*). Among other cases of following common usage are Ārya Samāj for Ārya Samāja and Brāhma Samāj for Brāhma Samāja and *sannyāsin* for *saṁnyāsin*. In some cases, technically accurate terms are used rather than those in common Western usage: e.g., *brāhmaṇa*, not *brāhmin*; *yogī*, not *yogi*. The words "buddhahood" and "buddha-nature" have been used because they are technically more accurate than the capitalized form.

Different authors not only sometimes strongly prefer different styles of editing, but also frequently prefer different translations of technical terms, and it would be presumptuous, even dangerous, for any editor to force such a learned group of authors into any single pattern of English equivalents. This policy seemed the better part of wisdom. Sometimes authors have used different styles of documentation—at no sacrifice of clarity.

In all the editing, clarity and ease of reading were the goals sought, provided that this attempt did not sacrifice technical accuracy. This seemed to be the only feasible guiding principle to follow.

One of the discrepancies in some of the papers is that between the use of Sanskrit terms and Pāli (and, in fact, of "Pāli" and "Pali") terms—sometimes almost indiscriminately. Some changes have been made, but, again, because of the editor's deferring to the wishes of the authors there are still some discrepancies in this area. A few specific examples should probably be mentioned: *Brāhmaṇas*, to refer to the texts, which are parts of the Vedas; *Brāhmaṇism*, to refer to the philosophy or religion which is based upon those texts; and *brāhmaṇa*, to refer to the highest order in society, the priest or teacher. Both *yogī* (Hindi) and *yogin* (Sanskrit) are used rather indiscriminately.

For the convenience of Western readers, plurals have been formed by simply adding a terminal "s" to words in Sanskrit, although this practice is not followed in the chapter by Dr. Malalasekera, where most of the terms are in Pāli. (The reader is referred to an editor's note at the beginning of that chapter which will explain the special style used there and the reason for that style.)

Appreciation is hereby expressed by the editor to Professor Kenneth K. Inada, Professor Walter H. Maurer, and Professor S. K. Saksena for their significant assistance in connection with the editing of these papers, and in connection with the transliteration of Sanskrit and Pāli terminology. Appreciation is also expressed to Princeton University Press for permission to re-publish, not completely but in large part, the paper by Professor Junjirō Takakusu, which was originally included in *Philosophy—East and West*, published by Princeton University Press in 1944.

Charles A. Moore

Honolulu
April 29, 1966