

## EDITOR'S WORDS

The current issue (volume 10, no. 1, January 2019) is a special one celebrating the tenth anniversary of this journal, *Comparative Philosophy: An International Journal of Constructive Engagement of Distinct Approaches toward World Philosophy* ('the Journal' for short below). In the past ten years since the Journal made its debut via its first issue in January 2010, with the quality as a top priority concern, the Journal has developed steadily and in a healthy way.

As indicated in the journal subtitle, the Journal goes with its "constructive engagement" emphasis in doing philosophy comparatively, which, so to speak, consists of six related methodological emphases (as highlighted in italics below) in a coordinate way: (1) it emphasizes *critical engagement*; (2) it emphasizes *constructive contribution* of each of the distinct parties in critical engagement through their learning from each other (though they might not be derivable from, or reducible to, each other) and make joint contribution to jointly-concerned issues in a complementary way (thus they are not absolutely incompatible); (3) it emphasizes *philosophical interpretation* of the addressed thinkers' texts instead of mere historical description; (4) it emphasizes the *philosophical-issue-engagement orientation* aiming at *contribution to the contemporary development of philosophy and society* on a range of philosophical issues that can be jointly concerned and approached through philosophical interpretation and from a broader philosophical vantage point; (5) it emphasizes that such engaging explorations need to be *guided by adequate methodological principles*; (6) it emphasizes *being open-ended and inclusive* regarding various (eligible) perspectives from distinct approaches in different traditions, through the foregoing emphases, and thus providing an effective and inclusive meta-methodological framework and platform of constructive engagement. For its earlier relatively systematic account, the interested reader can look at the journal-theme-introduction essay in the debut issue of the Journal (volume 1, no. 1, January 2010); for its further elaboration in an engaging-discussion setting, see the meta-methodological and meta-philosophical contributions in the current issue: three papers in the first "Constructive-Engagement Dialogue" section, respectively by Soraj Hongladaron, Wei Sun and this editor (their further revised presentation papers at the invited session on comparative philosophy held on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018, the 24<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Philosophy, Beijing, China), and one paper by Paul Dottin in the "Article" section on a creative application of the constructive-engagement strategy in elaborating Sino-African philosophy.

Indeed, with its distinct "constructive engagement" emphasis, the coverage of the Journal is unique compared to other journals in some connections. On the one hand, it

is more inclusive on jointly-concerned philosophical issues and topics: its coverage is restricted to neither one specific philosophical tradition nor one particular cross-tradition-engagement pair; it can include any particular cross-tradition-engagement pairs of distinct approaches from different philosophical traditions (whether distinguished culturally or by styles and orientations). In the past ten years, the Journal has published peer-reviewed articles addressing the constructive engagement of distinct approaches from African, Chinese, Indian, Islamic, Latin American as well as Western philosophical traditions, and from the analytic and “Continental” traditions from the vantage point of comparative philosophy. On the other hand, it is more focused-on and oriented towards its “constructive-engagement” emphasis, instead of mere historical description or being just inclusive without critical engagement: an open-minded and pluralist attitude in *doing philosophy* does not stop at being inclusive for its own sake or giving historical data presentation alone, but essentially demands further reflection on how these distinct resources and approaches from different philosophical traditions can critically engage with each other to constructively make joint contributions to the contemporary development of philosophy and the well-being of contemporary society.

The contents of this special tenth-anniversary issue are rich and well reflect the “constructive engagement” emphasis of the Journal, covering the valuable resources from African, Chinese, Indian, Latin American as well as Western philosophical traditions. This issue consists of two major parts, the “Articles” part and the “Constructive-Engagement Dialogue” part. The “Article” part includes five peer-reviewed articles respectively by the authors from Asia, Europe and North America: Fred Dallmayr’s article “Apophatic Community: Yannaras on Relational Being”, Minglai Dong’s article “Correcting Things as Correcting Feelings: A Phenomenological Study of Wang Yang-ming’s Doctrine of *Ge-wu*”, Adrian Kreuzt’s article “Recapture, Transparency, Negation and a Logic for the *Catuṣkoṭī*”, Joshua Stoll’s article on “Inference, Perception, and Recognition: Kaśmīr Śaivism and the Problem of Other Minds” as well as the aforementioned Paul Dottin’s article.

To highlight the constructive-engagement dialogue, this special issue features an enhanced “Constructive-Engagement Dialogue” part that consists of three distinct sections of constructive-engagement dialogues between the authors’ and their critics. Besides the aforementioned section on the explanatory potency of the constructive-engagement strategy, this part also includes the following two sections respectively on Latin American philosophy and philosophy of mind. The former section consists of Carlos Pereda’s engaging article, which addresses the views of Manuel Vargas’s article in the debut issue of the Journal and of another scholar Robert Sanchez, and Vargas’ “reply” article. The latter section consists of Carlos Montemayor and Abrol Fairweather co-authored review article on Jonardon Ganeri’s recent book in philosophy of mind, which resorts to the resources from Indian philosophy as well as contemporary philosophy of mind, and Ganeri’s “reply” article.

Bo Mou  
January 2019