

The macmillan encyclopedia of philosophy-40 years later : Encyclopedia of philosophy. 2nd edn. editor-in-chief donald M. Borchert. macmillan reference USA. thomson gale. detroit/New York, etc. 2006.10 volumes

[The original paper](#) contains 3 sections, with 5 passages identified by our machine learning algorithms as central to this paper.

Paper Summary

SUMMARY PASSAGE 1

Section 1

(1) Fewer individual philosophers receive an independent entry. This characteristic contrasts Indian philosophy not only with the treatment of Western philosophy, but also with the presentation of Indian philosophy in the first edition, where at least eight philosophers were considered important enough to be allotted separate entries. True, the choice is arbitrary, almost capricious: The sole Buddhist philosopher who was selected is Nāgārjuna; no Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Mīmāṃsā or Sāṃkhya philosopher were deemed worthy of an individual entry, and Vedānta (with Advaita, Rāmānuja and Madhva) is over-represented, as are philosophers of the 20th century at the expense of those from the 19 preceding ones.

SUMMARY PASSAGE 2

Section 1

The entries "Atomism," "Brahma" and "Self" are rather short, as are those on "Meditation," "Karma" and "Reincarnation." It is disconcerting that in spite of the availability of recent major studies on karma, 6 Ninian Smart's old articles were simply reprinted, all the more so because Smart introduced an infelicitous division between "karma" and "reincarnation"; it should have been clear to the editors that these two topics should not be treated separately. (5) Indian philosophy in this Encyclopedia is largely an American product.

SUMMARY PASSAGE 3

Section 1

Second, the cross-references, or rather their lack, are remarkable. For instance, it took me some time to discover that there are entries for Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu; neither is mentioned in the general entries "Indian philosophy" or "Buddhism." Further, Nāgārjuna is not cross-referenced in the article "Madhyamaka," nor is Vasubandhu in the article "Yogācāra."

SUMMARY PASSAGE 4

Section 1

Obviously, I cannot present or discuss here, even very briefly, all the entries on Indian philosophy in these volumes. The above remarks should suffice to indicate that they are of unequal quality and value. However, in spite of its evident deficiencies, the present edition is certainly an improvement on the preceding one.

SUMMARY PASSAGE 5

Section 1

And even if all three assumptions were correct, we would have to advance Vasubandhu's date by six decades, not by five or even less. If, on the other hand, we allow for a minimum of 20 years between the composition of the *Laṅkāvatāra* and its translation into Chinese, and a minimum of another 20 years between the composition of the two works, or assume that the passage in question is not a later interpolation, this means that Frauwallner's dating of the Younger Vasubandhu, namely 400-480, has to be advanced by at least 60-80 years, because Vasubandhu is supposed to have died shortly after the composition of the *Triṃśikā*. If one accepts Frauwallner's dating of the Older Vasubandhu to 320-380, this renders the two Vasubandhus almost contemporaries.