

Review of: "The Near-Death Experience and the Question of Immortality: A Philosophical Approach"

Purushottama Bilimoria¹

¹ University of Melbourne

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is very fascinating and amply publishable.

It would help if some philosophical discussions that come later were to be interwoven with the earlier, rather tedious details of after-life or NDE accounts or immortality (some of these have been gone over in the literature quite a bit, while the philosophical objections and criticisms have not).

Is it the question of whether immortality is *desirable*, or whether it is *possible*? But NDE and after-life may have nothing to do with either of these possibilities around immortality. I may know one day my soul will go extinct (in Hinduism even gods will, when their time comes, go extinct), and there is no body that dies then as it does in this mortal life. But still, I wish to live on for a few eons more to experience all that might be on the other side of this transient/temporal world, and take in as much as possible of the splendors and wonders of heaven. So I will wander on through the galaxies of the universe, whatever kinds of birth and death it requires for my soul to continue its journey onwards, upwards, or downwards, as the case may be. (This is also in Jaina metaphysics, and perhaps also in Plotinus: think of Parmenides' chariot onwards to the heavens). In other words, afterlife without immortality can be rather sweet so long as one is not stuck in one body alone for 600 years! One can trade it in for other, better or 'rising' bodies (astral, angelic, divine, and so on). Jesus' resurrection (celebrated widely yesterday) was perhaps one such feat that he carried out on this planet itself to demonstrate that this was possible (but Saul/Paul and the Church had misunderstood and misrepresented the miracle, if it was one). Has the author looked into *Bardo*, how the Tibetans describe, maybe also explain, the post-death experience (PDE)? A. J. Ayer's case is somewhat hilarious, and I would like to see the author take the mickey out of Ayer's subsequent denial of what was clinically confirmed NRE or even PDE.

A minor editing note: when the author first introduces a writer or author or authority, s/he should use their first name as well; subsequent occurrences can be with surname only. So e.g., Williams (2019) was very confusing to me, as the keywords only had Bernard Williams and I was looking out for him. The quote under Williams (2019) did not look like Bernie's writing, and 2019 would be too late anyway, he was gone by then – although people bring out second/3rd editions of earlier works (thus, Hegel 1991).

