

MAŁGORZATA GLINICKA

(University of Warsaw, Poland)

ORCID: 0000-0001-6764-7085

**On how to Speak about Universals and Particulars
in the Jaina Philosophical Literature of the Classical Period
(5th–10th c. CE)**

Abstract

The main concern of the present paper is to determine which types of linguistic descriptions are fit to properly express a complex reality such as developed in Jaina theory of universals and particulars presented in the Jaina Literature of the Classical Period (5th–10th c. CE) in order to demonstrate a way in which the Jaina theory of universals and particulars has an impact upon the way we describe reality through language. I take into consideration the fact that, according to the Jaina philosophy, reality is not describable in the complete way and that there is always – in any linguistic act of picturing the world – the margin of non-cognizance and non-expressiveness. The Jaina philosophy of language offers the original solutions, different from those given by other Indian thinkers, to the above-mentioned problems.

Keywords: *sāmānya*, *viśeṣa*, *vastu*, *artha*, *pramāṇa*, substance, mode

Introduction

The problem of universals (*sāmānya*) and particulars (*viśeṣa*), their epistemological, ontological and linguistic status create a complex set of important issues, which were a matter of interest for the Jaina philosophers of the classical period (5th–10th c. CE).



Some onto-epistemological aspects of the Jaina theory of universals and particulars have been discussed by Raja Ram Dravid,¹ Yelekyatharahalli Jinadathiah Padmarajiah,² Nathmal Tatia³ etc. The main concern of the present paper is to determine which types of linguistic descriptions are fit to properly express a complex reality such as developed in Jaina theory of universals and particulars. In order to settle the issue, signalized directly in the Jaina texts or inferred indirectly out of them, I take into consideration the fact, highlighted by Sagarmal Jain,⁴ that reality is not describable and that there is always – in any linguistic act of picturing the world – non-cognisance and non-expressiveness. In more detail I intend to show how Jaina theory of multidimensionality of reality (*anekānta-vāda*) and Jaina conceptions of particulars and universals are linked. According to this theory reality is multifaceted and heterogeneous and it should be considered from an infinite number of angles. Only by cognitive merging of all views and insights the ultimate image of reality could be complex and comprehensive. This theory has been developed through the philosophical dialogues existing between the different traditions (i.e. Bhartrhari, the Cārvaka, the Mīmāṃsā, the Nyāya, the Vaiśeṣika, the Sāṃkhya, the Buddhists). Jaina conception of universals and particulars contributed to the development of it as well, because objects of knowledge are describable both in terms of particular and universal, depending on one's perspective. However, the issue how the same thing is both universal and particular is one of many issues that is being tackled by this theory (next to the question of the relationship between a substance and its modes, of describing causal processes etc.). The theory of multidimensionality of reality is linked with the method of the sevenfold modal description⁵ (*syād-vāda*). This challenging method of describing reality has been recapitulated by N. Krishnaswamy as expressing clearly 'the essential features of Jainism.'⁶

¹ Raja R. Dravid *The Problem of Universals in Indian Philosophy*, ed. K. Ram, Delhi 2000, pp. 131–154.

² Yelekyatharahalli J. Padmarajiah, *A Comparative Study of the Jaina Theories of Reality and Knowledge*, Bombay 56, 1963.

³ Nathmal Tatia, *Studies in Jaina Philosophy*, Fremont 2006.

⁴ Sagarmal Jain, *The Jain Philosophy of Language*, Parshwanath Vidyapeeth Series No. 145, Varanasi 2006, pp. 105–107. Sagarmal Jain claims, "the reason of the inexpressibility of reality, in fact, lies in the limitations of the word-stock, word-power and confinement of the language with the limitations of existence and non-existence." Ibidem, p. 107.

⁵ Piotr Balcerowicz, 'The Logical Structure of the Naya Method of the Jainas', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29/3 (2001), p. 379.

⁶ Krishnaswamy admits that, "«Unknowability» combined with «unexpressability» is part of the human predicament". Natesan Krishnaswamy, 'India's Language Philosophy', *Tulsī Prajñā, Jain Vishva Bharati University. Research Quarterly*, 150 (2011), p. 12. Human beings are the only depositories of language, which enables them to name things and construct concepts. Language is basis of all philosophical thinking and discourse because it allows to organize knowledge of reality in the form of a string of arguments. The Jaina way of writing itself tells us a lot about capabilities of language: the more precisely it is used, the more exact scope of meanings it conveys. For example Jain realizes that one of early Jain texts *Samavāyāṅga* enumerates thirty five kinds of speech, such as 'speech to be impregnated with an expression of essential truth' (*mahārthatva*), 'speech to be non-contradictory to the preceding and following' (*avyāhata-paurvāparayatva*), 'speech to be free from any fault to be pointed out by others' (*apahr̥tānyōttaratva*), 'speech to be well arranged and opposed to unnecessary extension' (*aparakīrṇa*

Treatise of Logic') contains the following passage: "The meaning of a word is, according to us, the genus, form and individual" (*vyakty-ākṛti-jātayās tu padārthaḥ*) (NS 2.2.68) and is figurative (NS 2.2.64). For the Vaiśeṣika school the universal and the particular are two of the six categories (alongside *dravya*, *guṇa*, *karma* and *samavāya*), out of which the individual is that of the highest importance.¹³ The term '*viśeṣa*' has double denotation referring to the individual and the factor that differentiates two objects. An object and a word are 'unrelated' (*asambandhau*, VS 7.2.18) and the meaning of a word is conventional (*sāmayikaḥ*, VS 7.2.20). The position of the Sāṃkhya school has been expressed by the late philosopher Aniruddha (15th c. CE) in his *Sāṃkhya-sūtra-vṛtti* (SSV₁, 'A Commentary on *Sāṃkhya-sūtra*'), who claims that according to its representatives a universal property may exist but it should not be considered as eternal.¹⁴ He writes: "[...] similarity is the apprehension of an innate characteristic, which is the same in two things. This apprehension of similarity is not necessarily dependent upon the relation between a thing and its name (*samjñāsamjñīsambandha*), for sometimes a similarity is apprehended without recourse to language" (SSV₁ V.95–96).¹⁵ According to the Mīmāṃsakas there is eternal connection between the word and its meaning (MS 1.1.5) and one meaning can be related only to one word (MS 1.3.26–27). K. Kunjnuni Raja summarizes that for Prābhākara's school (from 7th c. CE) "the particular is known from the universal because of the invariable connection between the two" and that for Kumarila Bhāṭṭa's school (from 8th c. CE) "that the particular is obtained from the universal through *lakṣaṇā* or secondary significance."¹⁶ From the point of view of the Advaita Vedānta only the universals are the referents of words.¹⁷ Madhva (13/14th c. CE), the proponent of the Dvaita Vedānta, was of the opinion that "the particular was a combination of an infinitive number of qualities which were uniquely combined in that particular entity, such that while two things may be alike or similar in virtue of this or that quality, they are

the relation between the table and the floor. Samavāya is the constitutive or the inherent relation that exists, for example, between the whole and its parts, between attributes of actions and their substance, and between a universal and its particulars. Of these two relations, Saṃyoga is considered by the Naiyāyikas to be an attribute (*guṇa*) of the terms related, but samavāya is not taken as an attribute, but as an independent category by itself." Dharendra Mohan Datta, *The Six Ways of Knowing: A Critical Study of the Advaita Theory of Knowledge*, Delhi 1997, p. 91. I do not take into account the Nava-Nyāya school.

¹³ Padmarajiah, *Comparative Study of the Jaina*, p. 107.

¹⁴ Ramshankar Bhattacharya, G.J. Larson, and Karl H. Potter, *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Samkhya*, Delhi 1987, p. 365.

¹⁵ After Bhattacharya, Larson and Potter, *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, p. 366. Hariprasāda (20th c. CE), the author of the work of the same title, sums up: "A universal is a property inhering in many things; it is neither materiality nor consciousness, and it is noneternal. Recognition (*pratyabhijñā*) is based on it" (SSV₂ V.91–92, after Bhattacharya, Larson and Potter, *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, p. 523).

¹⁶ K. Kunjnuni Raja, 'Buddhist and Mīmāṃsā Views on Lakṣana', in: *Researches in Indian and Buddhist Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Professor Alex Wayman*, by Ram K. Śarmā, Delhi 1993, p. 195. I refer to this position in the submitted article 'The Denotative Meaning of a Word in the Jain Literature of the Classical Period (5th–10th c. CE) against Other Indian Philosophical Schools: A Comparative Synopsis'.

¹⁷ John A. Grimes, 'An Advaita Vedānta Perspective on Language', *Studies in Indian Tradition* 3 (1991), p. 120. Likewise. Cf. fn 8.

always different in terms of many others.”¹⁸ Rāmānuja (11/12th c. CE), the representative of the Viśiṣṭādvaita, proclaims that “spatio-temporally continuous particular entities or individual substances, the bearers of general properties, are the paradigmatic instances of what exists in our world and as such are the primary subjects of predication. They are organized into classes and identified under common concepts and sortals, but lack unique individual essences.”¹⁹ For some Buddhist philosophers only ultimate particularities (non-linguistic, non-conceptual, capable of efficient action) exist. Generalities, such as universal (*sāmānya*), class (*jāti*) and inherence (*samavāya*), apply to conceptual constructs of the mind, not to existing entities, so they are not real categories.²⁰ Dinnāga (5/6th c. CE) makes a distinction between knowledge of the universals (perception) and knowledge of the particulars (inference).²¹ He introduces the conception of ‘exclusion of other [referents]’ (*anyāpoha*) as the meaning of words (PSV 5²²), developed by other Buddhist thinkers such as Dharmakīrti,²³ Ratnakīrti²⁴ etc. Dharmakīrti and Chandrakīrti (7th c. CE) introduce the term ‘*svalakṣaṇa*’ (‘having its own specific characteristics’).²⁵ According to Jñānaśrīmitra (10th c. CE) “neither a particular object (*svalakṣaṇa*) nor a universal (*sāmānya*) can be the direct object of verbal knowledge.”²⁶ Padmarajiah explains, “In the process of «linguaging» we construct a conceptual form of the object which posits only the universal and this universal is achieved through various hierarchies/levels of differentiation or exclusion. [...] language creates difference (*bheda*) in the continuous and discrete reality. This difference leaves out unique particular (*svalakṣaṇa*) because it has no potential to express it.”²⁷

The Jaina philosophers have been discussing with representatives of all these schools which helps them to describe and by this to shape their own standpoint. In their philosophy language plays an important role: it is the carrier of cognitive content and the main

¹⁸ Eugene F. Bales, *A Ready Reference to Philosophy East and West*, Lamham 1987, p. 217. Likewise. Cf. fn 8.

¹⁹ Christopher J. Bartley, *The Theology of Ramanuja: Realism and Religion*, New York 2013, p. 45. Likewise. Cf. fn 8.

²⁰ Cf. Rajnish K. Mishra, *Buddhist Theory of Meaning and Literary Analysis*, Emerging Perceptions in Buddhist Studies, no. 10, Delhi 1999, p. 95.

²¹ Cf. Bimal K. Matilal, ‘Buddhist Logic and Epistemology’, in: *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology. Studies in the Buddhist Analysis of Inference and Language*, ed. Bimal K. Matilal, Robert D. Evans, Dordrecht, Netherlands 1986, p. 13.

²² Cf. Ole H. Pind, *Dignāga’s Philosophy of Language. Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti on anyāpoha. Part I and Part II*, Wien 2015.

²³ Cf. Vincent Eltschinger et al., *Dharmakīrti’s theory of exclusion (apoha). Part I, On concealing: an annotated translation of Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti 24,16–45,20 (Pramāṇavārttika 1.40–91)*, Tokyo 2018.

²⁴ Cf. Patrick McAllister, *Ranakīrti’s Proof of Exclusion*, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 98, Wien 2020.

²⁵ Dan Arnold, *Brains, Buddhas, and Believing: The Problem of Intentionality in Classical Buddhist and Cognitive-Scientific Philosophy of Mind*, New York 2012, p. 223.

²⁶ Shōryū Katsura, ‘Jñānaśrīmitra on Apoha’, in: *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology. Studies in the Buddhist Analysis of Inference and Language*, ed. Bimal K. Matilal and Robert D. Evans, Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster, Tokyo 1986, pp. 171–184.

²⁷ Padmarajiah, *Comparative Study of the Jaina Theories*, p. 104. Likewise. Cf. fn 8.

is characterized by self-modification (*sva-paryaya*), keeps its own essence (*adravat, dravati, droṣyati*) (NV 1.114a).

Māṇikyanandin, who dedicates the fourth chapter of *Parīkṣāmukha* (PĀ, ‘A Commencement to Investigation’) to the problem of the universals and the particulars (their ontology and cognizability), asserts that a thing is ‘characterized by the universal (homogeneity) and the individual’ (*sāmānya-viśeṣātmā [...] viśayaḥ*, PĀ 4.1). Anantavīrya conceptualizes them in *Parīkṣāmukha-laghu-vṛtti* (PĀLV, ‘A Short Commentary to *Parīkṣāmukha*’) ³¹ as ‘two characteristics’ (*lakṣaṇau*) and ‘two natures’ (*ātmānau*) of a thing (PĀLV 4.1). ³² The universal is of two kinds: ‘synchronic’ and ‘diachronic’ (*sāmānyaṃ dvedhā tiryag-ūrdhvatā-bhedāt*, PĀ 4.3). The synchronic universal (*tiryak*) is understood as ‘similar transformations, like «cowness» in [two representatives of species:] a calf and a heifer’ (*sadrśa-pariṇāmas [...] khaṇḍa-muṇḍādiṣu gotvavat*, PĀ 4.4), the diachronic universal (*ūrdhvatā*) is ‘the substance pervaded by modifications from previous to later [states], in the same way as clay [that is incarnated] in [all] lumps’ ³³ (*parāpara-vivarta-vyāpi dravyam [...] mṛd iva sthāsādiṣu*, PĀ 4.5). ³⁴ Anantavīrya characterizes both kinds of universals:

“For one eternal form, such as «cowness» etc., successively and simultaneously stands in contradiction to the efficacious action and because it is not able to appear in individuals, we have discussed that «the synchronic universal» is not one and has the nature of transformation of things [endowed with] similar form [...]. [«The diachronic universal» is] substance. And this [substance] is indeed characterised by something. It

³¹ The word ‘*laghu*’ may mean also ‘accessible’.

³² *tasya pramāṇasya grāhyo'rtho viśaya iti yāvat. sa eva viśiṣyate sāmānya-viśeṣātmā. sāmānya-viśeṣau vakṣyamāṇa-lakṣaṇau, tāv ātmānau yasyēti vighrahaḥ. tad-ubhaya-grahaṇam ātma-grahaṇam ca kevalasya sāmānyasya viśeṣasya tad-ubhayasya vā svatantrasya pramāṇa-viśayatva-pratiśedhārtham* (PĀLV 4.1).

³³ The translation of *sthāsa* as ‘a lump of potter’s clay’ after Piotr Balcerowicz, ‘How could a cow be both synchronically and diachronically homogenous, or on the Jaina notions of *tiryak-samānya* and *urdhvatā-samānya*’, in: *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols. [Proceedings of the International Conference on Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols, 31.03–2.04.1995 Toronto]*, ed. Narendra K. Wagle and Olle Qvarnström, SASP 11, Toronto 1999, p. 15, Visited 28 April 2018, <<http://www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/Balcerowicz1999b.pdf>>.

³⁴ Balcerowicz underlines that it was not an original concept of Māṇikyanandin. Siddharṣigaṇi, the author of *Nyāyavatāra* (‘An Introduction to Logic’), had already invoked to ‘the dyad of homogeneity subdivided into diachronic and synchronic’ (*ūrdhva-tiraścina-bheda-sāmānya-dvaya*). Piotr Balcerowicz, ‘Jak uczynić z krowy byt diachronicznie i synchronicznie homogeniczny, czyli o pojęciach *urdhvatā-samānya* i *tiraścina-samānya*’, *Studia Indologiczne* 5 (1998), p. 34. Balcerowicz specifies ‘the historical earlier equivalents’ of the synchronic and diachronic homogeneity, such as ‘being successively’ (*kramaṇa bhavanti*) and ‘being concomitantly’ (*saha bhavanti*) or ‘being present at the same time’ (*yugapad-avasthāyin*) and ‘being present not at once’ (*ayugapad-avasthāyin*) coined by Siddhasenagaṇi, ‘being successively’ (*krama-bhāvin*) and ‘being concomitantly’ (*saha-bhāvin*) coined by Akalaṅka and Vidyānandin, ‘the place of being successively’ (*krama-bhūva*) and ‘the place of being concomitantly’ (*saha-bhūva*) coined exclusively by Vidyānandin, and ‘changing successively’ (*krama-vivartin*) and ‘changing concomitantly’ (*saha-vivartin*) coined exclusively by Akalaṅka. Ibidem, p. 44. The concept of the homogeneity, as Balcerowicz acknowledges, has been taken into account in the Buddhist tradition outlined in *Citrādvaita-prakāśa-vāda* (‘A Doctrine of the Multiplicitous Manifestation of Non-Duality’) [CAPV]. Ibidem, p. 23.

receives former and later transformations, which means that it exists in the past and in the future, consequent upon three times. One [substance] pervades sequential transformations, as in the case of pervasion of indigo form etc. belonging to many [objects] being simultaneously in one, differentiated cognition.”³⁵

For Māṅikyanandin the individual is also divided into two types (*viśeṣaś ca*, PĀ 4.6): the mode and its contrariety (*paryāya-vyatireka-bhedāt*, PĀ 4.7). The modes, changing one after another, are the transformation in substance, like joy and sadness in a soul (*ekasmin dravye karma-bhāvīnaḥ pariṇāmāḥ paryāyā ātmani harṣa-viśādādivat*, PĀ 4.8). The contrariety is a dissimilar modification [found] in different objects, like a cow and a buffalo etc. (*arthāntara-gato visadrśa-pariṇāmo vyatireko go-mahiśādivat*, PĀ 4.9). Anantavīrya comments on the latter sentence: “The dissimilarity [of appearance] emerges exclusively when the counter-correlate is grasped” (*vaiśadrśyam [...] pratiyogi-grahaṇe saty eva bhavati*). He continues: “And it is not [true] that it is unreal, because it is relative. The reliance does not pertain to something which does not exist, as it is located in the real thing” (*na cāpekṣikatvād asyāvastutvam, avastuṇy āpekṣikatvāyogāt. apekṣāyā vastu-niṣtatvāt*, PĀLV 4.9).³⁶ No matter what kind of individual we describe and in what kind of relations it is regarded to be, we identify it as real.³⁷

The concepts of universal and particular are strictly connected with the Jain realistic ontology of substance (*dravya*) and its countless modes (*paryāya*).³⁸ Prabhācandra, stresses in *Prameya-kamala-mārtaṇḍa* (PKM, ‘The Lotus-like Sun [revealing] Cognisable Objects’), the commentary to PĀ, that each substance undergoes different stages. Continuity (*anvayirūpa*) of substance is based on its factual identity in all phases. It is not to be

³⁵ nityaika-rūpasya gotvādeḥ krama-yaugapadyābhyām artha-kriyā-virodhāt – pratyekaṃ parisamāptyā vyaktiṣu vṛṭty-ayogāc cānekaṃ sadrśa-pariṇāmātmakam evēti tiryak-sāmānyam uktam [...] dravyam. tad eva viśiṣyate parāpara-vivartta-vyāpīti pūrvāpara-kāla-varti-trikālānuyāyīty arthaḥ. citra-jñānasyaikasya yugapad-bhāvya-aneka-svagata-nīlādy-ākāra-vyāptivad ekasya krama-bhāvi-pariṇāma-vyāpitvam ity arthaḥ (PĀLV 4.4–5). Most of the Sanskrit passages in the article are translated by me. If I quote translation authored by some other scholar, I mention it in the footnotes.

³⁶ Prabhācandra realises, that every thing consists of many properties and is capable of executing causally efficient actions different from each other. The author of PKM proves that objects are internally contradictory but this kind of contradiction can never be treated as the absolute one (PKM, pp. 528–547). Underlying that relativity is inscribed in every structure, which has to be simultaneously positive and negative, he cogitates about the nature of a contradiction: an impossibility of concomitance, mutual exclusion, relation between sublated idea and sublating factor (PKM, pp. 547), as well as a problematic relation of the whole and the parts (PKM, pp. 547–564). On the basis on Balcerowicz and Potter, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 179–185.

³⁷ From the reflection on particularity the concept of common excluding characteristics has emerged, which is assigned to all elements of one group (i.e. the group of cows) without regarding the differences between respective subgroups (the subgroup of *sābaleya* cows or the subgroup of *bāhuleya* cows) and is not assigned to any element of the other group (i.e. the group of horses), which recalls inevitably a controversy about the Buddhist principle of exclusion (*apoha*). Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 289–290. Cf. NV 1.144–145a.

³⁸ Substance (*dravya*) and modes (*paryāya*) are mentioned in Jaina texts usually with qualities (*guṇa*). See: Soni 1991.

proved by indirect (*parokṣa*) cognitive criteria such as memory (*smaraṇa*) or recognition (*pratyabhijñāna*) (PĀ 3.1–2, PKM, pp. 488–504). Memory, as Māṇikyanandin put it, is an awareness ‘[endowed with] the form: «it is that» originating from the appearing of a trace’ (*saṃskārôdbodha-nibandhanā tad ity-ākārā*, PĀ 3.3), whereas recognition is ‘a combination caused by observation and memory [endowed with the form]: «it is verily that», «it is similar to that», «it is different from that», «it is opposite to that»’ (*darśana-smaraṇa-kāraṇakaṃ saṃkalanam [...] tad evēdam tat-sadrśam tad-vilakṣanam tat-pratīyogātyādi*, PĀ 3.4). The image of continuity that is real but not absolute (cf. TŚ 5.29–31),³⁹ constructed by the Jains with the help of the phrases such as: ‘continuance in being’ (*sthiti*), ‘cohesion of form’ (*anvayirūpa*), ‘permanence’ (*nityatā*) and ‘non-momentariness’ (*akṣanikatva*) (cf. PASāTD 10), has been criticised by the Buddhists (cf. YA 11, RVār 2.8.21, 5.22.16, PASāTD 8, LTS 20).⁴⁰ Prabhācandra, arguing with the Vaiśeṣika, expresses the opinion that in the face of the general volatility of the real the universal could not be considered as permanent (*nitya*) nor omnipresent (*sarvagata*) (PKM, p. 470).⁴¹

The Jaina thinkers analysed the aspect of continuance precisely. Samantabhadra for instance, arguing with Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika’s concept of *samavāya* (ĀM 4.61–66), expresses in *Āpta-mīmāṃsa* (ĀM, ‘An Instruction of the Authority’), commented by Akalaṅka in *Aṣṭa-śati* (AṣŚ, ‘Eight Hundred’), the conviction that a sequence of phases to be undergone by each thing must end. It takes the form of the question: what happens to the universal or the eternal relation (*samavāya*) between substance and its modes (between universal and particulars), which is ‘in one and the same [thing]’ (*ekaikatra*), ‘in its total form’ (*samāptih*) and ‘is not in any other thing’ (*antareṇāśrayam na syān*), when this very thing perishes (*nāśôtpādiṣu*) (ĀM 4.65). Considering the sole entity Samantabhadra assures that substance and modes as its constituents are one (*dravya-paryāyayor aikyam*) as long as they are not separate (*tayor avyatirekataḥ*) and the substance undergoes its specific modifications (*pariṇāma-viśeṣāc ca*) and possesses abilities with which it is endowed (*śaktimac-chakti-bhāvataḥ*). Both of them have their specific conceptual identification and number (*saṃjñā-saṅkhyāviśeṣāc ca*), as each one of them possesses peculiar characteristics (*svalakṣaṇa-viśeṣataḥ*) and they differ in their aims (*prayojanādi-bhedāc*), but – what is important in the light of the non-absolute context – they are not varied in all aspects (*ca tan-nānātvaṃ na sarvathā*) (ĀM 4.71–72).

³⁹ On the basis of Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 465–466.

⁴⁰ It is not only the characteristics of a real object (*vastu*) but also of a self (*jīva*, *ātman*) or *in aliis verbis* a person (*puruṣa*) (PASU 9–10), which concept has been radically rejected by the Buddhists (SŚP 20–29).

⁴¹ Balcerowicz and Potter, *Jain Philosophy*, p. 52. The reflection on substance requires an ascertainment of a way in which a thing is real. Haribhadra-sūri (8th c. CE) in *Anekānta-jaya-patākā* (AJP, ‘An Emblem of Victory of Anekānta [Doctrine]’) alleges that the real thing (*vastu*) has ‘the form of being and non-being’ (*sad-asad-rūpa*, *sattvam asattvam*) (AJP, p. 65). Frank van den Bossche raises the issue of existence and non-existence in AJP in Freya van den Bossche, ‘Existence and non-existence in Haribhadra Sūri’s Anekānta-jaya-patākā’, *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Iss. 4 (1995), pp. 429–468.

Similar characteristics or modifications can regard different objects. The problem of whether the universal defined as similar transformations in two representatives of species and the substance pervaded by modifications should be considered in terms of similarity or identity has been raised by Akalaṅka who postulates usage of the term ‘similar’ or ‘uniform’ (*samānā*) (NV 2.193–194a). Prabhācandra indicates the interrelatedness of the notions ‘universality’ and ‘similarity’ by means of usage of the term ‘oneness’ (*ekatva*):

“The oneness is twofold: principal and metaphorical. In the case of substance like the soul etc. [it is] principal, but in the case of similarity (similar things) [it is] metaphorical. Hence if the universal were eternal [and] omnipresent [it] would be a cause of many errors and falsehood”.⁴²

Through the term ‘oneness’ an appearance of the similar characteristics (or even the same) or modification in one entity or different entities has been expressed. If it regards the same substance identity is called ‘oneness’ in principal meaning, if it regards different substances ‘oneness’ is equivalent to similarity.

The opposing category to oneness is separateness (*prthaktva*) of universal and particular. Samantabhadra writes that ‘one [thing] cannot be produced out of itself’ (*naikam svasmāt prajāyate*) (ĀM 2.24). He claims that the concepts such as ‘oneness’ and ‘separateness’, when disassociated (*anapekṣe*), are unreal (*avastu*), because they are based on two different radical assumptions (*dvaya-hetutaḥ*). They should be considered as apparently discrepant features of one empirical fact (*tad*) (ĀM 2.33). All kinds of relative relations, such as contact (*saṃyoga*) of objects possessing concrete qualities, their separation (*vibhāga*), remoteness (*paratva*) and proximity (*aparatva*), are derivatives of oneness and separateness, and according to Prabhācandra they could not be considered as qualities (PKM, pp. 587–600).⁴³

⁴² dvividhaṃ hy ekatvam – mukhyam, upacaritaṃ ca. mukhyam ātmādi-dravye. sādṛśye tūpacaritaṃ. nitya-sarvagata-svabhāvavte sāmānyasyāneka-doṣa-duṣṭatva-pratipādanāt (PKM, p. 481).

⁴³ Balcerowicz and Potter, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 188–190. Vidyānandin in *Aṣṭa-sāhasrī* (AS, ‘Eight Thousand’), a commentary to Akalaṅka’s *Aṣṭa-śatī* (AṣṢ, ‘Eight Hundred’), apposes separation to union of entities as complementary characteristics, favouring their complementarity from the point of view of their relativity (AṣS 33). The considerations on *sāmānya* and *viśeṣa* are also in AṣṢ 2, 9, 11, 13, 25, 34, 37–39, 40–43, 50–52, 55–59; on *śabda* in AṣṢ 62, on *jāti* in AṣṢ 64–65, (67)68(69) etc. Centuries-old speculations on these subtle issues have been marked in the later period (15th-century) in Malliṣeṇa-sūri’s treatise *Syād-vāda-mañjari* (SVM, ‘The Cluster of Blossoms of *Syād-vāda*’), the commentary to Hemachandra’s (11/12th) *Anyayoga-vyavacchedikā* (AV, ‘The Refutation of Other Systems’), with the reference to universality and particularity: “to suppose that universality and particularity are things apart is not logical, since they are presented only as attributes of things. And attributes are not absolutely differentiated from the bearer of the attributes; because, if they were altogether distinct, the relation of attributes and subject would be unaccountable, and because it would follow that a young elephant and a donkey could be designated attribute and subject (respectively). And, if it were supposed that attributes also are things apart, an infinite number of things even in one single entity would be the consequence, since an entity has an infinite number of attributes” (SVM, p. 20). English translation of all SVM’s fragments after F.W. Thomas.

Jaina philosophers affirm that the thing endowed with the nature consisting of substance and mode can be cognized.⁴⁴ According to Akalañka, the human mind considers the substance and the mode as distinct, although they are simultaneously identical and different, as they cannot live without each other. After realizing that ‘there is no union [between them] because of [their] separation’ (*samsargo nāsti viśleṣāt*) but ‘[this] separation is not absolute because of the union [at some level]’ (*viśleṣo ’pi na kevalam samsargāt*), he explains an epistemological intuition in the following way: ‘because all entities appear in that manner in cognition’ (*sarva-bhāvānām tathā samvitti-sambhavāt*) (NV 2.186). In another place he realizes that it is ‘enlightened in consciousness’ (*buddhau pratibhāsanāt*) (LT, LTV 2.7). Māṅikyanandin’s first statement in the fourth chapter of PĀ is: “the subject of cognitive criterion is a thing characterized by the universal and the individual” (*sāmānya-viśeṣāt mā tad-artho viśayaḥ*) (PĀ 4.1). Prabhācandra, convinced that elimination of ignorance is a result of the cognitive criterion (*pramāṇa*), commenting on this passage claims: “the object is the content of the cognitive criterion endowed with the nature [foreordained] to attain it” (*tasya pratipādita-prakāra-pramāṇasyārtho viśayaḥ*) (PKM, pp. 624–628). The author of PĀ asks what the object of the cognitive criterion means and he explains the thesis formulated in the first stanza:

“For there is the scope of cognition of [encompassing] the repeatable and the excluded and for [the thing] undertakes the efficacious action because of the transformation [characterized by] the permanence through removing and obtaining subsequent forms – former and latter.”⁴⁵

Anantavīrya elucidates this stanza in the following way:

“[Cognition,] that has a form of repetition, has the form: «a cow» and «a cow». [Cognition,] that has a form of exclusion, has the form: «black» and «dappled». The state of it (the thing), which underlies the scope of these [two, i.e. the act of repetition and the act of exclusion,] is its essence. And in that way, through this [saying], it has been demonstrated that the real thing is of a twofold nature, which is the individual characterised by the [specific] trait different from the «synchronic» universal. The removing and the obtaining of former and latter forms [is undertaken] respectively, [and] there is a [relative] firmness of these two. And what possesses the firmness of these two for its characteristics and it is transformation. As a result of that the real thing becomes capable of acting out (itself) as endowed with

⁴⁴ Jyoti P. Jain, *Religion and Culture of the Jains*, Delhi 2010, p. 60.

⁴⁵ anuvṛtta-vyāvṛtta-pratyaya-gocaratvāt pūrvōttarākāra-parihārā-vāpti-sthiti-lakṣaṇa-pariṇāmenārtha-kriyōpapatteś ca (PĀ 4.2).

two specific characteristics (the removing and the obtaining of former and latter forms) and named as a mode of the «diachronic» universal.⁴⁶

Prabhācandra comments on the same fragment:

“[The PĀ 4.2’s phrase:] «because it (the object) is the scope of cognitive act [encompassing] the repeatable and the excluded» [should be explained in the following way:] which scope of cognitive act makes visible the [thing] that has such form, that [one] [is] considered as being of that nature, like [in the case of] an object of indigo colour, which scope of cognitive act makes visible the indigo form. And the object to be cognized, [whether] internal [or] external, complete, [is that kind of object in the case of which] the scope of cognitive act [encompassing] the repeatable and the excluded [forms] makes visible the universal and the particular and that is why [we may presume that the thing] possesses the nature of the universal and the individual.”⁴⁷

Each philosopher stresses a different aspect. Anantavīrya explains these two forms of cognition in an accurate way, pointing to the essence (*tattva*) of a thing, which underlies their scope, and its capability of undertaking efficacious actions due to its twofold nature. Prabhācandra directs attention to the sole cognitive act and to the fact that it helps unveil the nature of a thing – making visible the universal and the particular – whether it is external or internal.

Although cognitive acts (encompassing the repeatable and the excluded) may lead to detailed apprehension of a thing, the Jaina thinkers prove that perception does not grasp it fully.⁴⁸ Akalaṅka expresses it in the following way:

⁴⁶ anuvṛttākāro hi gaur-gaur ityādi-pratyayaḥ. vyāvṛttākāraḥ śyāmaḥ śabala ityādi-pratyayaḥ. tayor gocaras tasya bhāvas tattvam, tasmāt etena tiryak-sāmānya-vyatireka-lakṣaṇa-viśeṣa-dvayaṭmakam vastu sādhitam. pūrvōttarākārayor yathā-saṅkhyena parihārāvāpti, tābhyāṃ sthitiḥ saiva lakṣaṇam yasya, sa cāsau pariṇāmaś ca, tenārthakriyōpapatteś cēty anena tūrdhvātā-sāmānya-paryāyākhyam viśeṣa-dvaya-rūpaṃ vastu samarthitaṃ bhavati (PĀLV 4.2).

⁴⁷ anuvṛtta-vyāvṛtta-pratyaya-gocaravāt, yo hi yad-ākārōllekhi-pratyaya-gocaraḥ sa tad-ātmako dṛṣṭaḥ yathā nīlākārōllekhi-pratyaya-gocaro nīla-svabhāvōrthaḥ, sāmānya-viśeṣākārōllekhy-anuvṛtta-vyāvṛtta-pratyaya-gocaras cākhilo bāhyādhyātmika-prameyōrthaḥ, tasmāt sāmānya-viśeṣātmēti (PKM, p. 467).

⁴⁸ According to a different classification model there are two different types of cognitive faculties (*upayoga*): perception (*pratyakṣa*) and vision (*darśana*). The apprehension of reality is possible for human beings in two ways: in sequence through a contact with its selected aspects and through immediate and interrupted view in which concrete aspects are obscured. Hariḥbhadrā-sūri expresses their specificities in the following way, “There would be no succession in grasping everything uninterruptedly by [a person] endowed with senses which scope consists of entities simultaneously targeted, because what does not appear in succession, is a subject of vision. Hence, this [person] sees a shape which can be described as a collection, then consequently [they] just hear a word, smell a smell of a water lily, consume a taste of camphor etc., touche a place of sitting by a sense of touch and

“Grasping [the thing] entirely would happen because of the lack of degrees in all beings, [one who] does not wander the ship etc. does not see the outer [world]. And it is not like that that the form is not associated with the form of cognition, hence not all qualities of grasped entity are grasped.”⁴⁹

Akalañka, and after him Māṇikyanandin, introduces the category of vividness (*vaiśadya*, *viśada*) which is important from the point of view of apprehending qualities of an object. Akalañka refers to a kind of awareness, ‘in which particular characteristics of an object are reflected’ (*viśeṣa-pratibhāsanam*, LT 1.4). Māṇikyanandin defines vividness as ‘illumination without any other apprehension or possession of some distinguished property’ (*pratīty-aṃtarāvyaavadhānena viśeṣavattayā vā pratibhāsanam*, PĀ 2.4).⁵⁰ They both claim that ‘perception [is] cognition [that is] clear’ (*pratyakṣam viśadam [jñānam]*) (LT 1.3, PĀ 2.3), ‘as empirical and transcendental’ (*mukhya-saṃvyavahārataḥ*) (LT 1.3), for this reason it is said to be direct cognition. Qualities perceived in a vivid manner are selected by the mind based on similarity. Clear apprehension of particularities enables one to name each representative of some larger group, each transformation of one substance and to determine at a linguistic level the image of an object endowed only with qualities shared by these representatives as well as to identify substance that continues to transmogrify itself. Transcendental cognition is caused by senses and mind and is partially clear (PĀ 2.3). Indirect cognition (*parokṣa*) (LT 1.3, PĀ 3.1) is the second cognitive criterion, caused by perception, defined by Akalañka as ‘the act of apprehending the rest’ (*śeṣa-vijñānam*) (LT 1.3) and enumerated by Māṇikyanandin as memory (*smṛti*), recognition (*pratyabhijñāna*), reduction to absurdity (*tarka*), inference (*anumāna*) and scripture (*āgama*) (PĀ 3.1). Each of these cognitive criteria is used in a different way. Only a particular thing can be the object of perception (*pratyakṣa*),⁵¹ grasped when it comes into view, endowed with the exact qualities, in a specific place at a specific time. The universals are important in the case of inference (*anumāna*) as objects of acts of

think about something – their measure of everything is truly incessant” ([...] na bhavet yugapad-gocarī-bhūta-
 viśayēndriyavato’vicchedena sarvōpalabdhou kramapekṣe’py akramasyaiva darśanāt. sa hi vaṃśādi-vādayitū[m]
 rūpaṃ paśyati, tadaiva tataḥ śabdaṃ śṛnoti, nīlōtpalādi-gandhaṃ jighrati, karpūrāde rasam ākhādayati, āsanādi-
 sparsaṃ sprśati, cintayati ca kiñcit, iti tattvato’syānavaratam sarva-paricchittih, AJP, p. 153).

⁴⁹ sarvātmananāṃ niramśatvāt sarvathā grahanam bhavet
 nauyānādiṣu vibhrānto na na paśyati bāhyataḥ.
 na ca nāsti sa ākāraḥ jñānākāre’nuśaṅgataḥ
 tasmāt drṣṭasya bhāvasya na drṣṭaḥ sakalo guṇaḥ (NV 1.148–149).

⁵⁰ anumānāvvyatirekeṇa viśeṣa-pratibhāsanam
 tad-vaiśadyaṃ mataṃ buddher vaiśadya-mataḥ param (LT 1.4).

⁵¹ Cf. The term ‘percept’ has been used by Bertrand Russell in: Stephen Mumford (ed.), *Russell on Metaphysics: Selections from the Writings of Bertrand Russell*, New York 2003, pp. 123–142.

conception.⁵² For this view, the Jains are deeply indebted to the Buddhists, especially Dharmakīrti.⁵³

Haribhadra-sūri, who was presumably Akalaṅka's contemporary⁵⁴ and the author of numerous philosophical works, claims in *Anekānta-jaya-patākā* (AJP, 'An Emblem of Victory of *Anekānta* [Doctrine]') that consciousness appears as creating a form of the universal (*sāmānya-kārā buddhir utpadyate*) by pointing out: "this is a pot, that is a pot" (*ghaṭo ghaṭa iti*) amongst many pots (*ghatādiṣu*), and a form of the particular (*viśeṣākārā ca*) by pointing out: "this is a lump of earth, that is [a lump of] copper, that is [a lump of] silver" (*mārttikas tāmro rājata iti*) or "it is not a cloth etc." (*paṭādir vā na bhavatīti*). He stresses that "the real being of the thing is not ascertained only because of the real being of the thing" (*na cārtha-sad-bhāvo rtha-sad-bhāvād eva niścīyate*), as there would be "an unwanted consequence that all true natures are known by everyone" (*sarva-sattvānām sarva-jñātva-prasaṅgāt*) and that "all things do not differ with respect to their real nature" (*sarvārthānām eva sad-bhāvasyāviśeṣāt*). The real being of the thing is ascertained "by the true nature of the cognition of the thing" (*artha-jñāna-sad-bhāvāt*): "the cognition having a form of the universal and the particular" (*jñānam ca sāmānya-viśeṣākāram*) "is produced exactly that way" (*evōpajāyata iti*). In other words "the real thing [has] a form of the universal and the particular" (*sāmānya-viśeṣa-rūpaṃ vastv*), because of achieving apprehension (*ato 'nubhava-siddhatvāt*) (AJP 3, p. 134).⁵⁵

Prabhācandra recognises this issue in yet another way and points out that we reassure ourselves that the universal exists, when we perceive objects endowed with similar qualities or specimens of the same type. He uses the term 'firmness of individuals' (*vyakti-niṣṭhatayā*) which is associated with the synchronic homogeneity (*tiryak-sāmānya-svarūpam*) and repeatability of the universal, juxtaposed to unrepeatability of the individuals. A person, while standing from a distance, can grasp only the universal, because the specific characteristics of the particular object are hidden at that moment. Accepting Māṅikyanandin's point of view on the synchronic universal and the diachronic one, Prabhācandra rejects the conception, diffused by the Nyāya, that the universal is a class of objects (PKM, pp. 482–487), and with this, he also rejects the conception of the Buddhists, according to which universals can only qualify constructions of the mind, not existing entities:

⁵² Cf. Russellian 'concepts'. See: Ibidem, pp. 123–142. Douglas Daye recapitulates that the Jains "hold that every entity is cognized as both a particular-*(viśeṣa)*-in-the-universal (*sāmānya*); that is, in questions of *vyāpti cum-anumāna*, the *sāmānya* is prominent; in *pratyakṣa* (perception) the *viśeṣa* is prominent". Douglas D. Daye, 'Circularity in the Inductive Justification of Formal Arguments (*tarka*) in Twelfth Century Indian Jaina Logic, Studies in Indian Philosophy', in: *A Memorial Volume in Honour of Pandit Sukhlalji Sanghvi*, ed. Dalsukh Malvania, Nagin J. Shah, L.D. Series, Ahmedabad, p. 110.

⁵³ Ethan Mills, *Three Pillars of Skepticism in Classical India: Nagarjuna, Jayarasi, and Sri Harsa*, Lanham 2018, p. 102.

⁵⁴ Cf. datation after Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*.

⁵⁵ Alongside other issues Haribhadra-sūri's interests on this subject are to be seen in other places: *pratyakṣasya svalakṣaṇa-viśayatvena* (AJP, p. 248); *sāmānya-grahaṇena viśeṣāntara* (AJP, p. 250); *asvalakṣaṇam ca vikalpaḥ* (AJP, p. 252); *kiṃcit-sāmānya-grahaṇena viśeṣāntara-samāropād iti cet, kim atyanta-bhedinām sāmānyam?* (AJP, p. 269).

“[Prabhācandra:] It has been rejected that the Brahminhood is what pervades all individual brahmins, and [what is] eternal, because it is not recognised as having this kind of nature through the cognitive criterion, like perception etc. [The Nyāyayika:] But it (the Brahminhood) is indeed recognised through perception: «this is a brahmin, that is a brahmin». And this [perception] is not a false cognition, because of the lack of sublation. And it is not a doubtful cognition, because of the lack of that [factor], which oscillates between two extremes. And the individual manifestation of this (the Brahminhood) manifests itself together with an instruction preceded by cognition of his father’s Brahminhood etc., and it [manifests itself together with an instruction] also in this [case – of his father together with preceding cognition of the Brahminhood of his father’s father]. And in that case there is no logical regressus ad infinitum, as in the case of a seed and a sprout etc., because it is always without beginning – [invariable concomitance] which is mutual, based on an instruction having a form of this and that.”⁵⁶

Prabhācandra admits that inference is also not capable of proving the fact that the universal pervades individuals endowed with common qualities. Further, he devotes a great deal of attention (PKM, pp. 488–504) to the discussion with Buddhists (mainly with the theory of momentariness) in regard to his reflection on diachronic homogeneity, according to which the human mind (perception) is capable of capturing consecutive forms of one substance.⁵⁷

The Jainas assert that the universals and the particulars can be grasped only in the case of the usage of valid cognitive criteria but they are not sufficient when it comes to full elucidation of an infinitely complex substance and mode composition.

2. The Describability of the Universals and the Particulars

This ontological and epistemological conception, due to its ostensible complexity, implies a specific solution to the problem of naming things (infinitely complex composition of substance and modes) or describing phenomena (composition in relation). The Jainas mark out the perspective of things and the perspective of human verbal activity.

⁵⁶ etena nityaṃ nikhila-brāhmaṇa-vyakti-vyāpakam brāhmanyam api pratyākhyātam. na hi tat tathā-bhūtam pratyakṣādi-pramāṇataḥ pratīyate. nanu ca ‘brāhmaṇo’yaṃ brāhmano’yam’ iti pratyakṣata evāsya pratipattiḥ. na cēdam viparyaya-jñānam; bādhakābhāvāt. nāpi saṃśaya-jñānam, ubhayāmsānavalambitvāt. pitrādi-brāhmaṇya-jñāna-pūrvakōpadeśa-sahāyā cāsya vyaktir vyañjikā, tatrāpi tat sahāyēti. na cātrānavasthā bījānkurādivad anāditvāt tat tad-rūpōpadeśa-paramparāyāḥ (PKM, p. 482). Cf. NS 5.1.

⁵⁷ nanu pūrvōttara-vivarta-vyatirekeṇāparasya tad-vyāpino dravyasyāpratītito’sattvāt katham tal-lakṣaṇam ūrdhvatā-sāmānyam sat, ity apy asamīcinam, pratyakṣata evārthānām anvayirūpa-pratīteḥ pratikṣaṇa-viśārarutayā svapne ‘pi tatra teṣāṃ pratīty-abhāvāt. yathaiḥ pūrvōttara-vivartayor vyāvṛtta-pratyayād anyonyam abhāvaḥ pratītas tathā mṛd-ādy-anuvṛtta-pratyayāt sthītir api (PKM, p. 488).

It was analysed in return by Siddhasena Divākara, listed by Jayendra Soni among three “pioneers of Jaina philosophy whose basic ideas set the trend for most later thinkers” (alongside Kundakunda and Umāsvāti), in *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇa* (STP, ‘A Treatise on Correct Reasoning’).⁵⁸ Siddhasena Divākara juxtaposes the mode of expression (*vyāñjana-paryāya*) and the mode of things (*artha-paryāya*),⁵⁹ strengthening this polyperspectivity through concentration on dualities of different extremes, such as existence of a thing connected with language and deprived of it, sameness and difference inherently encoded in substance etc.:

“[The thing] is not necessarily invariable due to dissimilar conditions [which should be considered as] opposite modes. Moreover, even among similar [entities one thing that] exists from [the perspective] of words, does not [exist] from the perspective of things. A substance in the present mode also occurs as sharing or halting. For the peculiarities of qualities, having the infinite form, begin from one quality.”⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Jayendra Soni, *Kundakunda, Umāsvāti and Siddhasena Divākara. Jaina philosophy*, doi:10.4324/9780415249126-F005-1, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, London 1998, Visited 09 June 2020, <<https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/overview/jaina-philosophy/v-1/sections/kundakunda-umasvati-and-siddhasena-divakara>>.

⁵⁹ Adinath Neminath Upadhye defines *vyāñjana-paryāya* as ‘stationary wave motion happening in the parts of the substance’. Adinath N. Upadhye et al. (ed.), *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, Bhagavān Mahāvīra 2500th Nirvāṇa Mahotsava Samiti 1977, p. 170. Indukala Jhaveri claims that Siddhasena uses this term ‘to signify a series of changes which has such similarity as to allow it to be called by one name’. Indukala H. Jhaveri, *The Sāṅkhya-yoga and the Jain: Theories of Parīṇāma*, Ahmedabad 1990, p. 154. The phrase ‘*artha-paryāya*’ is often translated as ‘intrinsic change of *dravya*’ (i.e. K.B. Jindal (ed.), *The Prefaces*, Calcutta 1958, p. 33).

⁶⁰ parapajjavehiṃ asarisagamehiṃ niyameṇa ṇiccamavi natthi
 sarisehiṃ pi vaṃjaṇao atthi ṇa puṇa’tthapajjāe
 paccuppanṇammi vi pajjayammi bhayaṇāgaṃ paḍai davvaṃ
 jaṃ egaguṇāyā aṇaṃtakappā gamavisesā (STP 3.5–6, pp. 167–170).
 para-paryāyair asadrśa-gamair niyamena nityam api nāsti
 sadrśair api vyañjanato’si ṇa punar artha-paryāyair
 pratyutpanne’pi paryāye bhajanāgatiṃ patati dravyam
 yad eka-guṇādikā ananta-kalpā guṇa-viśeṣāḥ (Sanskrit chāyā).

Vijayakīrti Yaśasūri in *Pārśva-prabhā-ṭīka* (PPt, ‘Commentary to the Light of Parśva’), commentary to STP, writes: “Among similar modes there is substance, like a pot etc., through the perspective of words acquired in three tenses, because they are verbalized by a word. The perspective of words of that [substance], having the nature of a universal character, [is] marked by [modes] that have the nature of an individual character. In that case the universal properties [that] have a form of the real substance, like earthiness etc., [and] in like manner the particular properties [that] have a form of pot-ness etc., are known [as] to be expressed in words. Nevertheless, the intended substance, like a pot etc., is not just through intrinsic changes [of substance], because the perspective of things changes [at the level of] expression grasping peculiar characteristics of the real thing doing away with each other, having different forms while being considered, are not to be expressed in words”. *sadrśa-paryāyēs* api tri-kālānugatair vyañjana-paryāyair ghaṭādi-dravyam asti, teṣāṃ śabda-vācyatvāt. tad-vyañjana-paryāyā api sāmānya-dharmātmakā viśeṣa-dharmātmakāṣṭā. tatra sāmānya-dharmāḥ sad-dravya-prthivītvādi-rūpās tathā viśeṣa-dharmā ghaṭatvādi-rūpāḥ śabda-pratipādyā jñeyāḥ. kintv artha-paryāyair vivakṣita-ghaṭādi-dravyam nāsty eva, paraspara-vyāvṛtta-vastu-svalakṣaṇa-grāhaka-rju-sūtra-nayābhimatārtha-paryāyāṇām pratikṣaṇa-bhinna-rūpāṇām śabdāvācyatvāt (PPt, p. 166). *Sammati-tatva-sopānam* (STS, ‘The Ladder to Correct Categories’), comprising

The author of STP reaches the conclusion that the expressibility can be assigned only to the thing that is considered as existing from the perspective of words. He points out that the substance can be described with reference to its transformations in time:

“The present state, which is similar to the past and the future [states] and which is removed for another substance – this is what this speech determines. As the substance [is] changed, in the same manner there is: participation and separation in the relation to the past and future modes exactly in that case (substance).”⁶¹

This stanza explains that words can refer to all phases of one thing and all specimen of one kind, so they grasp the diachronic universal and the synchronic universal. These notions (i.e. the mode of expression and the mode of things) appear also in *Ālāpa-paddhati* (‘The Course of Question’) (ĀP 15–16, 19) by Devasena.

of STP and Abhayadevasūri’s commentary *Tattva-bodhi-nivṛtti* to it, contains many reflections on that subject (i.e. the universal and the particular in the language context) that can be observed in the following issues raised: the expressibility (*vācakatva*) of ‘a word that has the nature of the individual characterized by the universal’ (*sāmānya-viśiṣṭa-viśeṣātma-śabda*); refutation of the statement: ‘there is no universal in a word’ (*śabde sāmānyam nāsti*) (STS, p. 18); the knowableness of cognitive criteria such as a word etc.; grasping the substantiality of a word; the achievement of substance through a word endowed with differentiating characteristics; rejection of the standpoint, according to which there is existence in the individual through inner relation (*sattā-sambandha*); the existence of ‘a quality differentiating’ (*viśeṣa-guṇatva*) one substance from the other one (STS, pp. 49–50); the description of authoritativeness (*pramānya*) of a word in the case of external objects (STS, p. 60); the exposition of the conviction that the meaning of a word is ‘a grammatic rule’ (*vidhi*); grasping the instrumental cause of a word in the form of ‘characteristics of substance’ (*dravya-guṇa*) (STS, p. 62); ‘the state of naming things’ (*vastu-abhidhāyatva*) (STS, p. 63); the establishment (*siddhatva*) of the universal; the non-accomplishment (*anupapatti*) of the universal ‘in the case of ubiquity of everything’ (*sarva-sarva-gatatve*); errors connected with grasping the universal in the case of a pot etc., grasped ‘in a different place’ (*anyatra*) (STS, pp. 64–65); the lack of assent (*anabhyupagama*) of the universal extinguished ‘by all individuals inherent in it’ (*vyapakaika-sarva-vyakti*) (STS, pp. 66–67); the problem of ‘the word convention’ (*śabdasya saṅketa*) (STS, pp. 74–75); the meaning of a word understood as ‘exclusion’ (*apoha*) (STS, p. 76); a word presented as ‘endowed with the nature of the certainty that the real thing has the nature of both: [the universal and the particular]’ (*śabdasya apy ubhaya-atmaka-vastu-niścayātmakatvam*) (STS, p. 84); ‘the peculiar form of the perspective of a word’ (*śabda-naya-svarupam*) (STS, p. 105); an explanation of the verse: ‘the perspective of substance is not free from the individual and the perspective of modes is not free from the universal’ (*viśeṣa-vinirmukto dravyārthikaḥ sāmānya-vinirmuktaḥ paryāyārthiko vā nāstīti*) (STS, p. 138); the association ‘the state of *vyāñjana-paryāya* with a word’ (*śabdasya vyāñjana-paryāyatva*) (STS, p. 165) and many other issues.

⁶¹ paccupoannaṃ bhāvaṃ vigayabhavissehiṃ jaṃ sammaṇṇeī
 eyaṃ paḍuccavayaṇāṃ davvaṃtaraṇissiyaṃ jaṃ ca.
 davvaṃ jahā pariṇayaṃ taheva atthi tti tammi samayammi
 vigayabhavissehi u pajjaehiṃ bhayaṇā vibhayaṇā vā (STP 3.3–4, p. 163).
 pratyutpannaṃ bhāvaṃ vigata-bhaviṣyadbhyāṃ yat samānyēti
 etat pratītya-vacanaṃ dravyāntara-niḥṣṭam yac ca.
 dravyaṃ yathā pariṇataṃ tathaiva asti iti tasmin samaye
 vigata-bhaviṣyadbhis tu paryāyair bhajāṇā vibhajāṇā vā (Sanskrit chāyā).

Another example of a distinction between the domain of words and the domain of things is Akalaṅka's distinction between two perspectives: of things (*artha-naya*) and of words (*śabda-naya*) (SV 10–11,⁶² LT 4.72, RVār 1.32.8–9), on the basis of which he postulates a strict relation between a word and an individual (SV 9,⁶³ LT 4.27). Vidyānandin, the commentator on Akalaṅka's AṣṢ, distinguishes in *Aṣṭa-sahasrī* (AṣS, 'Eight Thousand') between 'the state of words' (*śabda-bhāvanā*) and 'the state of things' (*artha-bhāvanā*) with a stipulation that 'an activity of human being is through words' (*śabdena [...] puruṣa-vyāpāro bhāvvyate*) (AṣS 1.3, p. 64). Māṇikyanandin (and after him Anantavīrya and Prabhācandra) stresses mainly the ability of activating the cognition of a thing through the utterance of an authority (PĀ 3.95, cf. PĀLV 3.95, PKM, pp. 391–399⁶⁴) and claims that "words are the causes of the cognition of things by means of linguistic convention in the presence of innate semantic fitness" (*sahaḥa-yogyatā-saṅketa-vaśād dhi śabdādāyo vastu-pratipatti-hetavaḥ*, PĀ 3.96, cf. PĀLV 3.96, PKM, pp. 427–431⁶⁵). All these positions note the correlation between things, words and human activity.

The main specificity of the way in which a substance together with modes can be presented verbally, according to the Jaina philosophy, is a coexistence between the universals and the particulars. Siddhasena Divākara has already raised the issue of how this mutual reliance is reflected in the way people take account of them in their references:

"The particular [is] mentioned with reference to the general, while its opposition [is mentioned with reference] to it (the particular). [Such indication] causes [one] to consider the transformation of substance as the other and causes it to be withheld. And [a person] characterizing [something which is] not different from one point of view as different from the other point of view causes the turning of substance away from modes and modes away from substance (modes are substance)."⁶⁶

⁶² After Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 303–305.

⁶³ After Ibidem, p. 303.

⁶⁴ With the help of Balcerowicz, Potter, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 163–164.

⁶⁵ With the help of Ibidem, p. 165.

⁶⁶ sāmaṇṇāmmi viśeso viśesapakṣhe ya vayanāvīṇiveso
davyaparīṇāmamaṇṇamā dāei tayaṃ ca niyamei
egaṃtaṇivīśesaṃ eyaṃtavīśesiyam ca vayanāṇo
davyassa pajjave pajjavā hi daviyaṃ niyattei (STP 3.1.1–2).
sāmānye viśeṣo viśeṣa-pakṣe ca vacana-viniveśaḥ
dravya-parīṇāmam anyam darśayati takam ca niyamayati
ekānta-nirviśeṣam ekānta-viśeṣitam ca vadan.

dravyasya paryāyān, paryāyebhyo dravyam nivarttayati (Sanskrit chāyā after STP 3.1.1–2).

In PPT we read: "The characteristics of the universal and the individual are known through perception [grasping] substance after substance. Both of them are mutually and uninterruptedly connected. In the real being of one the real being of the other [is present], hence in the unreal being of one the unreal being of the other [is present]. The speaker, who claims that «the universal [is] separated from the individual», separates the substance from the mode of the substance – this [presupposition leads to] an unwanted consequence in that the substance, endowed with the nature of modes, is non-existent. In that way the speaker by saying «the universal [is] separated from the

The same intuition has been expressed by Akalaṅka (AṣṢ 111, NV 1.145b–146, 2.185b–206a⁶⁷). Māṅikyanandin, by stressing that a thing is characterized by the universal and the particular, has in mind their indefeasible importance and relationship. Anantavīrya writes that comprehension of both of them (*tad-ubhaya-grahaṇa*) and of nature as such (*ātma-grahaṇa*) is inevitable in order to negate the possibility that only universal or particular, or both of them, but independently, are the scope of a cognitive criterion (PĀLV 4.1), which can have also linguistic character. Prabhācandra develops this idea by accentuating that a thing possesses external and internal form (*bāhyādhyātmika*) and transforms itself in a way that it keeps its continuance in being (*sthiti*) and simultaneously it excludes previous form and acquires the new one (*pūrvōttarākāra-parihārāvapti*, PKM, pp. 466–467). This co-occurrence and mutual referentiability of the universal and the particular foredoom the uniqueness of the Jainas position.

S. Jain acknowledges that according to the Jaina philosophy, an “expressive-expressed (*vācya-vācaka*) relation between word and its object” (cf. LT 3.20) is “limited and relative”, hence the word has “a limited capability of expressing its object.”⁶⁸ Pointing to the confining factors of the expressibility of linguistic units he signalizes the importance of a context, within which speech is formed, the role of individual abilities of people involved in the speech act and of the deficient capability of words.⁶⁹ Jain identifies four forms of indescribability taken into account in the Jain treatises:

“Firstly, the affirmation of «is and is-not» simultaneously is not possible, hence the thing is indescribable. Secondly, there may be infinite viewpoints and as such with all the viewpoints simultaneously a thing cannot be asserted, and accordingly the thing is inexpressible or indescribable. Thirdly, the thing is possessed of multiple specific qualities and in language, there is no word to describe all the specific qualities, hence the thing is indescribable. Fourthly, the universal-word cannot express a particular thing in its entirety, with all its peculiarities.”⁷⁰

The first form of indescribability is connected with the constant propensity of the human mind to affirm or negate all aspects of reality. For Samantabhadra the substance

individual», turns the substance away from the modes, hence the conclusion [is] that the modes [are] no different from the substance”. *pratidraṅyam sāmānya-viśeṣa-dharmau pratyakṣeṇa jñāyete. tau cōbhau parasparānusyūtau. ekasya sad-bhāve’parasyāpi sad-bhāvas tathāikasyāsadbhāve’parasyāpy asad-bhāvaḥ./ viśeṣa-rahitaṃ sāmānyam iti vadan vaktā dravyasya paryāyān dravyād dūrī-karoti, tena payāyātmakasya dravyasyāpy abhāva-prasaṅgaḥ. tenaiva prakāreṇa sāmānya-rahitaṃ viśeṣam iti vadan vaktā paryāyebhyo dravyaṃ nivarttayati, tena dravyābhinnānām paryāyānām api nivṛtti-prasaktiḥ* (PPt, p. 158). Term *parasparānusyūta* is used also in In Vijaya Darśana-sūri’s *Ṣaṃmati-tarka-mahāṅṅavāvatārikā* (“The Prologue to the Great Ocean of [the Treatise on] Correct Reasoning”), the commentary to STP (STM, p. 265).

⁶⁷ After Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 269, 290, 294.

⁶⁸ S. Jain, *Jain Philosophy of Language*, p. 105.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 105–106.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 111–112.

is established by affirmation or negation, and the nature devoid of all characteristics (*asarvântam*) would be a non-entity (*avastu syād*), being neither a qualificand, nor a qualifier⁷¹ (*aviśeṣya-viśeṣanam*) (ĀM 3.46b). He claims that “the denial of the named [thing] should not be restricted [only] when [this thing] is true in a certain case” (*saṃjñīnaḥ pratiśedho na pratiśedhyād ṛte kvacit*) (ĀM 2.27). Even negation (*niśedha*) can be used only with the reference to an existing entity, denoted by a word (*saṃjñīnaḥ sataḥ*) through an assignment of different substance etc. being inwardly (*dravyādy-antarabhāvena*). A hypothetical entity (*bhāva*) of the non-existing kind (*asad-bheda*) could not be a domain (*sthānam*) neither of affirmation (*vidhi*) nor of negation (*niśedha*) (ĀM 4.70). Both of them add up to the primary strategy of responding to infinite contexts of the ‘multiverse’ but they need to be properly used in order to avoid inconsistency and contradiction.⁷² Akalaṅka expresses the same opinion in AṣṢ 109. Notions of affirmation (*vidhi*) and negation (*niśedha*, *pratiśedha*) are important in Māṅikyanandin’s view on inference – under his considerations on twofold nature of inference: inference for oneself (*svārthānumāna*) and inference for others (*parārthānumāna*) – where positive reason (*hetu*) based on apprehension (*upalabdhi*) and negative one based on non-apprehension (*anupalabdhi*) both concern affirmation and negation (PĀ 3.53–54).⁷³ Anantavīrya adopts this view without commenting on this (PĀLV 3.53–54). Prabhācandra devotes five passages to the description and analysis of the problem starting from Māṅikyanandin’s stanza (PKM, pp. 378–383).⁷⁴

The second form of indescribability assumes the possible choice of one option among infinite perspectives, which is a direct consequence of the envisaged structure of reality. Amṛtacandra-sūri, in *Pravacana-sāra-tattva-dīpikā* (PSTD, ‘The Light of Categories in *Pravacana-sāra*’), the commentary to Kundakunda’s *Pravacana-sāra* (PS, ‘The Quintessence of Sermons’), underlines that “«An object» i.e. a verbally denoted thing «is made of substance», being an aggregation (*samudāya*) of particulars (*viśeṣātmika*) classifiable in the terms of persistent features (*viśtāra-sāmānya*) and specific features (*āyata-sāmānya*)”⁷⁵ (PSTD 2.2). In his other work Amṛtacandra-sūri ascertains that when a person wants to describe one feature of reality, this feature, ‘intended to be spoken’ (*vivakṣita*), should be considered as ‘primary’ (*mukhya*), and other features become inferior (*guṇa*), accompanying the first one (*mukhya sakhya*) (LTS 17.421). The proof of partial expressibility of reality is provided by the theory of predications (perspectives or viewpoints) (*naya-vāda*), referred to by many Jaina thinkers (e.g. ĀM 9.106–107, LT 4.30, ST 1.3–5, ĀP 2–3), defined by Chakravarthi Ram-Prasad as ‘circumscribed schemas’.⁷⁶

⁷¹ Cf. Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, p. 146.

⁷² Krishnaswamy, ‘India’s Language Philosophy’, p. 12.

⁷³ sa hetur dvedhōpalabdhy-anupalabdhi-bhedāt. upalabdhir vidhi-pratiśedhayor anupalabdhī ca (PĀ 3.53–54).

⁷⁴ Cf. Balcerowicz and Potter, *Jain Philosophy*, pp. 159–162.

⁷⁵ After Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, p. 504.

⁷⁶ Chakravarthi Ram-Prasad, *Indian Philosophy and the Consequences of Knowledge: Themes in Ethics, Metaphysics and Soteriology*, London 2016, p. 13. There are seven suggested predications: comprehensive (*naigama*), collective (*saṅgraha*), empirical (*vyavahāra*), direct (*rju-sūtra*), verbal (*śabda*), etymological (*samabhirūḍha*) and

They distinguish seven perspectives from which each thing can be considered.⁷⁷ From the point of view of the present article the most important are two perspectives: the conventional perspective (*naigama-naya*) and the collective perspective (*saṅgraha-naya*). Kulkarni summarizes that the first one is

“a method of referring to an entity where its generic and specific characteristics are not distinguished from each other. It recognises both the *sāmānya* (universal) and the *viśeṣa* (particular) but regards each of these as absolute and self-sufficient.”⁷⁸

The second one is “the viewpoint which ignores all particulars and takes note of the general (*sāmānya*) only”.⁷⁹ Padmarajiah comments that this very

“standpoint concerns itself with the general or the class character of a factual situation, unlike the *naigama* standpoint which includes the specific character as well. Just as *naigamanaya* is not hostile to the intermingled character of concrete existence, so also *saṅgrahanaya* is not repugnant to the complementary feature of *viśeṣa* which is not included in it. *Saṅgrahanaya* marks a step further from *naigamanaya* in that it differentiates, in its analytical process, the common character from the universal-cum-particular complex which every real is.”⁸⁰

Akalaṅka stresses that a perspective can be proper or not:

factual (*evaṃ-bhūta*). Piotr Balcerowicz, ‘Some Remarks on the Naya Method’, in: *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion [Proceedings of the International Seminar on Jainism ‘Aspects of Jainism’. Warsaw University 8th–9th September, 2000]*, Delhi 2003, p. 48. Cf. Piotr Balcerowicz, ‘The Logical Structure of the Naya Method of the Jainas’, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29/3 (2001), pp. 379–403. Malliṣeṇa-sūri, denominates this model of description ‘seven nuances arisen from distinction of expression’, but he acknowledges that this system ‘has in each nuance the own-nature of complete expression (*sakalādeśa*), and the own-nature of incomplete expression’ (*vikalādeśa*) (SVM, p. 139).

⁷⁷ Cf. ĀP 39–41.

⁷⁸ Vitthal M. Kulkarni, *Relativity and Absolutism*, in: *Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda)*, ed. Nagin J. Shah, Delhi 2000, p. 64.

⁷⁹ Ibidem.

⁸⁰ Padmarajiah, *Comparative Study of the Jaina Theories*, p. 316. The collective perspective is divided into two types: ultimate (*parā-saṅgraha*) and non-ultimate (*aparā-saṅgraha*). John Grimes writes: ‘While the former is the highest general Outlook for which all the objects are part of the extant object, the latter dilates upon the general traits of different kinds’. John A. Grimes, *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy: Sanskrit Terms Defined in English*, Albany 1996, p. 274. The first one refers to such notions as ‘being’ and ‘existence’, the second one – to ‘principle of motion’ (*dharmā*), ‘principle of rest’ (*adharma*) and ‘time’ (*kāla*). Both has been mentioned by Haribhadra-sūri, Akalaṅka, Vidyānandin and Yaśovijaya etc. See: Krishna K. Dixit, *Jaina Ontology*, Ahmedabad-9 1971, pp. 122–123, 126, 139–141, 144, 152, 161.

“When [a thing,] that has the nature of difference and non-difference, is to be cognized, these erroneous perspective and [proper] perspective, which have difference and non-difference as [their] object, are defined by reference and non-reference [to them].”⁸¹

According to him the collective perspective aims at pure substance (*suddham dravyam abhipraitī*) without taking into account its division (*tad-abhedataḥ*). There is no non-existing nature (*nāsad-ātmā*) in particular things (*bhedānām*, LT 4.32). This viewpoint is because of the non-differentiation of existence, which is one and total (*sarvam ekaṃ sad-aviśeṣād*). It is not possible for any cognition to grasp a particular thing without cognizing the substance endowed with a form of existence (*na [...] kiñcij-jñānaṃ sad-rūpaṃ dravyam anavabuddhya bhedaṃ gr̥hṇāti*, LTV 4.32). The conventional perspective is ‘due to exposing identity and difference in the case of one [entity] consisting of mutual qualities’ (*anyōnya-guṇa-bhūtaika-bhedābheda-prarūpaṇāt*, LT 4.39). Akalaṅka qualifies that “the conventional perspective [is] the intention of speaking about properties [located] in one bearer of properties through the relation between a quality and the primary nature; speaking of the endless division would be a fallacy of this [perspective]” (*guṇa-pradhāna-bhāvena dharmayor eka-dharminī/vivakṣā naigamo 'yanta-bhedōktiḥ syāt tad-ākṛtiḥ*, LT 4.68). In commentary he explains: “The difference [between these two perspectives] is that in the conventional perspective intuition [is directed towards] the bearer of qualities and qualities or the bearer of properties and properties through the relation between a quality and the primary nature not intending to speak of the identity of nature between qualities and the bearer of qualities, between a whole and [its] parts, between an action and the doer, and between the generic properties and those who possess them etc., in the collective perspective etc. intuition [is directed towards] one [quality]” (LTV 4.68).⁸² Māṅikyanandin does not raise the issue of perspectives, only suggests it at the end of his treatise: “Other possible [issues] should be analysed” (*sambhavad anyad vicāraṇīyam*, PĀ 6.74) but his commentators refer to it. Anantavīrya enumerates and defines all seven standpoints categorising them into two root perspectives (*mūla-naya dvau*): substantial (*dravyārthika*) and modal (*pariyāyārthika*).⁸³ He defines after Akalaṅka the conventional perspective (*anyōnya-guṇa-pradhāna-bhūta-bhedābheda-prarūpaṇo naigamaḥ*) and gives an etymological interpretation of a word ‘naigama’ (*naikaṃ gamo naigama iti nirukteḥ*). The collective perspective “which is dependent on the opposition is obtaining [the entity] of which only existence is predicable” (*pratipakṣa-savyapekṣaḥ sanmātra-grāhī saṃgrahaḥ*) (PĀLV 6.74). Prabhācandra defines the conventional perspective as ‘obtaining exclusively the idea of an incomplete thing’ (*aniṣpannārtha-saṅkalpa-mātra-*

⁸¹ *bhedābhedātmake jñeye bhedābhedābhisandhayaḥ
ye te'pekṣānapekṣābhyāṃ lakṣyante naya-durnayāḥ* (LT 4.30).

⁸² *guṇa-guṇinām avayavy-avayavānām kriyā-kāraṇāṇām jāti-tadvatāñ cētyādi-tādātmyam avivakṣitvā guṇa-guṇinoḥ dharmi-dharmayor vā guṇa-pradhāna-bhāvena vivakṣā naigame, saṃgrahādāv eka-vivakṣēti bhedaḥ.*

⁸³ *tatra dravyārthikas tredhā – naigama-saṅgraha-vyavahāra-bhedāt. pariyāyārthikaś caturdhā – rju-sūtra-śabda-samabhirūḍhaivambhūta-bhedāt.*

grāhī) and the collective perspective as taking place ‘due to comprehension of a whole in opposition to inherent parts of a thing to be reduced to one sort through consistency with its own generic properties’ (*svajāty-avirodhenaikadhyam upanīyārthānākṛānta-bhedān samasta-grahaṇāt*) (PKM, pp. 676–677). The concept of perspectives has been evolving in the Jaina philosophy and maturing the way of considering the abilities of language to express reality.

The unique variant of the theory of predication has been proposed by Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa, who discerns in *Naya-cakra* (‘A Wheel of Perspectives’) three modes of considering things: ‘affirmative’ (*vidhi*), ‘affirmative and restrictive’ (*vidhi-niyama*) and ‘restrictive’ (*niyama*),⁸⁴ creating the twelve-spoked wheel of standpoints (*dvadaśa-naya-cakra*). He defines the universal as is continuant, affirmative and real (*sāmānyam pravṛtti vidhir bhāvaḥ*) and the particular as restrictive and non-existent (*viśeṣo ’pi... niyamō ’bhāvaḥ*) (DNC 7, p. 536).⁸⁵ Muni Jambūvijayajī, the editor of DNC, completes these definitions with other determinants. The universal, according to his addenda, is connected with substance (*dravya*), association (*anvaya*) and the bearer of a mark (*dharmin*), the particular – with cessation (*nivṛtti*), mode (*pariyāya*), distinction (*vyatireka*), mark (*dharma*) and otherness (*anyatva*). Opposing the view that ‘nothing is expressible’ (*avaktavya-vadī*),⁸⁶ Mallavādin investigates the problem of mutual inexpressibility of the universal and the particular, analysing conditions of the occurring of identity and difference with regard to a certain given thing,

“The individual is grasped as separate and as one individual due to the fact that it is not different from its [own] form, with being of which the oneness and the otherness are associated and from which being is said to be inexpressible by the followers of the theory of oneness and otherness, that [is] individual, one by one, because one characteristic is not the discriminating factor.”⁸⁷

The philosopher elucidates, in what way this being should be described,

“And this [being] is the real thing because it is not separate from the individual, like in the case of one’s own soul, because that individual is the real being, i.e. the entity, i.e. that which exists. And from that reason

⁸⁴ Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, p. 203.

⁸⁵ Mallavādin pays a lot of attention to that subject, especially in the I, VII, VIII and X book. The Book VII contains divagations on the entity (DNC 7, pp. 538–539), in which the crucial term is ‘substance’, which is not connected with ‘existence’ (*satta*) (DNC 7, p. 546). The Book VIII emphasizes notions of being (*bhāva*) i non-being (*abhāva*).

⁸⁶ Malvania and Soni, *Jain Philosophy*, p. 209.

⁸⁷ *yathā bhinno’py eko viśeṣaḥ svarūpād avyatiriktavād viśeṣa evābhyupagamyate. yasya bhāvena sahaikatvānyatvādi vicāryate yasmāc ca bhāva ekatvānyavādibhir avaktavya ucyate eṣa viśeṣo’py ekaikāḥ. avyatireko hy eka-lakṣaṇam* (DNC 10, pp. 772–773).

indeed only the individual [can be considered], because of identity with this [real thing]. From where [does] inexpressibility (lit. the state of not being spoken) of this [real thing take place]? The individual certainly is not inexpressible, because it is not separate from the individual, like in the case of one's own soul. And thus, because of the inexpressible statement concerning the ascertained thing, it would be an unwanted consequence consisting of the usage of a similar argument. That is why [the sentence] to be expressed [is]: «just individual», the general meaning is inexpressible, because of [its] separateness from the individual, like in the case of one's own soul. You want assuredly the universal [that is] inexpressible to be inexpressible in that way – in that case the individual is not expressed in the form «it is the individual», because of non-differentiation of the individual, like the universal [that is] inexpressible. In the state of its (the individual) being inexpressible and in the state of having been inexpressible of the real thing, because they are not mutually expressive, the universal of both is not to be expressed, what is applicable [is] expressible – the same [is] the individual.”⁸⁸

To strengthen his position of inexpressibility of the real thing, the particular and the universal Mallavādin quotes radical theses formulated by one of Jaina adversaries. The opponent in this presentation distinguishes the real thing from the individual one,

“The real thing is something separable from the individual because it is inexpressible. But indeed the expressibility in the state of non-existence [is] the expressibility in the state of existence of this [real thing], as it has been said by you [that] insubstantiality [is] non-existing, because [it is] indescribable. Like the real thing [is] differentiated from the individual, in the same way the individual [is] differentiated from the real thing, and indeed from which [is] their non-existence. The real thing does not exist, because of the lack of the characteristic difference, like in the case of the flower of heaven. The individual does not exist, because of the non-discernibility of the real, like in the case of the flower of heaven. And thus copiousness of concepts of the otherness and the oneness of the

⁸⁸ sa ca vastu viśeṣāvyatiriktatvāt tat-svātmavat, bhavatīti bhāva iti sattārthatvāt tasya. tataś ca viśeṣa-mātram eva. tad-ekatvāt kuto'vacanīyatā tasya. na hi viśeṣo'vacanīyaḥ, viśeṣāvyatiriktatvāt, tat-svātmavat. tathā ca nirdhāritārthāvaktavya-vacanād yādṛcchika-vyavahāra-prasaṅgaḥ. tasmād avaktavya-sāmānyārtho 'viśeṣa eva' iti vaktavyaḥ, viśeṣāvyatiriktatvāt, tat-svātmavat. atha tathāpy avacanīyam evāvacanīya-sāmānyam icchasi evaṃ tarhi viśeṣo viśeṣa ity avacanīyaḥ, viśeṣāvyatiriktatvāt, avaktavya-sāmānyavat. tasyāpy avācyatve vastunaś cāvācyatve tayoḥ parasparam avacanīyatvād ubhayato'py avacanīyam sāmānyam vacanīyam prasaktam, tathā viśeṣo'pi (DNC 10, pp. 773–774).

particular and the universal like in the case the ether, repetition because of the... the fruit only in the form of a pain...”⁸⁹

Mallavādin’s highly sophisticated concept aims at exhausting the ways of expressing intuitions of each aspect of reality that are reliant on preferences of the human mind.

The third form of indescribability in the S. Jain’s analysis is connected with an inherent complexity of entities and their dynamic mutual relations with other entities. The multifold reality and existence in their outwardly incongruent nature can be, according to the Jains, conceptualised only in a relative way in terms of capacities and modalities. The theory of modal description (*syād-vāda*),⁹⁰ broadly discussed by the Jain thinkers of the classical period (e.g. ĀM 1.13, 2.32, 9.101–106, 112–113, YA 30–33, 47, RVār 1.6.5, LTS 8.12, 18–20, 17.1, 17–25, 18.25, AśŚ 13), being an adoption of the theory of multiplicity of reality (*anekānta-vāda*),⁹¹ has been called by modern scholars as the ‘fundamental principle’,⁹² ‘the principle of coherence’,⁹³ and ‘the doctrine of the relativism

⁸⁹ atha viśeṣa-vyatiriktaṃ vastu avaktavyatvāt. nanv evaṃ tasya bhāvatve vaktavyaiva abhāvatve’pi vaktavyataiva. tathā tvad uktaṃ apy avastutā abhūtāvaktavyatvāt, yathā ca vastu viśeṣād vyatiriktaṃ tathā viśeṣo’pi vastuno vyatiriktaḥ. evaṃ ca tad evāsattvam anayoḥ. vastu asat, aviśeṣatvāt, kha-puṣpatvāt. viśeṣo’py asan, vastu-vyatiriktatvāt, kha-puṣpavat. tathā ca sāmānya-viśeṣaikatvānyatvādi-vikalpa-prapañcanam ākaśa-romanthatav parikleśa-mātra-phalamayathārthatvāt (DNC 10, pp. 774–775).

⁹⁰ The theory of modal description has been broadly discussed on the Indian (Jain and non-Jain) and Western ground. Filita Bharuch and R.V. Kamat describe it in terms of a deviant logic. Filita Bharucha and R.V. Kamat, ‘Syādvāda Theory of Jainism in Terms of a Deviant Logic’, in: *Encyclopaedia of Jainism*, Vol. 24, ed. N Nagendra K. Singh, Indo-european Jain Rearch Foundation, New Delhi 2001, pp. 6299–6302. Goyal considers it in the context of intentional fallacy. This specific theory displays the selective nature of human mind that after getting the image of a snippet of reality is instantaneously orientated to its inverse image. S. Goyal, ‘Syādvāda and Intentional Fallacy: A Comparative Study’, *Tulsī Prajñā, Jain Vishva Bharati University. Research Quarterly* 154 (2012), pp. 35–41. Many scholars have tried to find a proper model of reasoning for it with the help of modal operators. Cf. R.N. Mukerji, ‘The Jaina Logic of Seven-fold Predication’, in: *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, ed. Upadhye et al., pp. 225–233; Bimal K. Matilal, *The Central Philosophy of Jainism (Anekānta-vāda)*, L.D. Series 79, Ahmedabad 1981; Piotr Balcerowicz, ‘Do attempts to formalise the syad-vada make sense’, in: *Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy*, ed. Peter Flügel and Olle Qvarnström, London–New York 2015, pp. 181–248. It inspired, as Ramkrishna Bhattacharya mentions, modern scientists to use it in their investigations. As an example he mentions: Prashanta Chandra Mahalanobis, the statistician, J.B.S. Haldane and D.S. Kothari – mathematics, zoology and physics. Ramkrishna Bhattacharya, ‘Syādvāda in the View of Three Modern Scientists’, *Jain Journal. A Quarterly on Jainology* XXXV/1 (2000), p. 19.

⁹¹ The theory of multiplicity of reality has had an enormous impact upon other systems of thought. A work of B. Jain (2000) is an example of an analysis dedicated to the rudiments of this theory in early Pāli literature. Uno (2000: 40) notes: “*Syādvāda* is established as a knowledge or its expression based on words of reliable person (*āpta-vacana*) or śruta (= *āgama*) which constitutes a part of indirect knowledge (*parokṣa-jñāna*), and as such is always accompanied by verbal expression. Thus it represents, so to speak, a sort of verbal reflection of the Jaina doctrine of non-absolutism (*anekānta-vāda*)”.

⁹² Atsushi Uno, *A Study of Syād-vāda (With a special reference to Syādvādamañjarī)*, in: *Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda)*, ed. Nagin J. Shah, Delhi 2000, p. 33.

⁹³ Davendra M. Shastri, *A Source-Book in Jaina Philosophy*, (trans.) T.D. Kalghatgi, ed. T.S. Devodoss, Sri Tarak Guru Jain Granthalaya, Udaipur 1983, p. 241.

of judgements’,⁹⁴ of which ‘rudiments [are to be] found in Vedic and Buddhist literature.’⁹⁵ Others, such as Māṇikyanandin and Anantavīrya, do not pay much attention to it in their analysis, although they are aware that the real thing is multi-fold (*anekāntātmaḥ vastu*) (PĀ 3.85, PĀLV 3.85, 4.1–2). Anantavīrya mentions in one place ‘adherents of *syād-vāda* theory’ (*syād-vādhīr abhidhīyate*, PĀLV 3.85, 4.1), so he is conscious of its functioning and meaning. And he uses the phrase ‘an object of cognition, [...] equipped with the term *syāt*, [...] armed with totality of infinite properties’ (*syāt-kāra-lāñchitam [...] ananta-dharma-sandoha-varmitam [...] prameyam*) at the end of the fourth chapter. Prabhācandra uses the term *syād-vāda* only three times without considering the whole theory.⁹⁶ The elements of modal description are usually formulated in the following way: “1) from a particular point of view it is (*syāt asti*), 2) from a particular point of view it is not (*syāt na asti*), 3) from a particular point of view it is and it is not (*syāt asti na asti*), 4) from a particular point of view it is inexpressible (*syāt avaktavyam*), 5) from a particular point of view is and it is inexpressible (*syāt asti avaktavyam*), 6) from a particular point of view it is not and it is inexpressible (*syān na asti avaktavyam*), 7) from a particular point of view it is and it is not and it is inexpressible (*syāt asti na asti avaktavyam*).”⁹⁷ Taking into consideration universality and particularity of the thing, they are regarded as (non-)existing and (non-)describable whilst being cognizant of the opposite that would occur in the case of another set of conditions. Krishnaswamy makes an assumption that adapting the theory of multiplicity of reality to language may be deconstructionist in its character.⁹⁸ The ontological paradox of this constation has been described by Atsushi Uno,

⁹⁴ Bharucha, Kamat, *Syādvāda Theory of Jainism*, p. 6298.

⁹⁵ Bhagchandra Jain, ‘Rudiments of Anekāntavāda in Early Pāli Literature’, in: *Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets*, p. 121.

⁹⁶ śrī *syād-vāda-vidyāyai* namaḥ (PKM, preamble); atha “pūrvavat – kāraṇāt kāryānumānam, śeṣavat – kāryāt kāryānumānam, sāmānyato dṛṣṭam – akārya-kāraṇād akārya-kāraṇānumānam sāmānyato ‘vinābhāva-mātrāt” [*Nyāya-bhāṣya*, *Nyāya-vārttika* 1.1.5] iti vyākhyāyate, tad apy avinābhāva-niyama-niścāyaka-pramāṇābhāvād evāyuktam pareṣām. *syād-vādinām* tu tad yuktam tat-sad-bhāvāt ity ācāryaḥ svayam eva kārya-kāraṇēty-ādinā hetu-prapañce prapañcayisyati (PKM, p. 368); yad api – pūrvavat pūrvam liṅga-liṅgi-sambandhasya kvacin niścāyād anyatra pravartamānam anumānam. śeṣavat pariśeṣānumānam, prasakta-pratiśedhe pariśiṣṭasya pratipatteḥ. sāmānyato dṛṣṭam viśiṣṭa-vyaktau sambandhāgrahaṇāt sāmānyena dṛṣṭam, yathā gatimān ādityo deśād deśāntara-prāpter devadattavad iti. tad apy etena pratyākhyātam, ukta-prakārāṇām pramāṇataḥ prasiddhāvinābhāvānām pratipādayiṣyamāṇa-hetu-prapañcatvena *syād-vādinām* eva sambhavāt (PKM, p. 369).

⁹⁷ I mention these seven modes of description in the forthcoming article ‘The Problem of Truth in the Jain Philosophy of Language of Classical Period (5th-10th c. CE)’. One of the examples of this kind of reasoning and expressing: 1) *syād* āpekṣikī siddhiḥ, tathā vyavahārāt, 2) *syād* anāpekṣikī pūrva-siddha-svarūpatvāt, 3) *syād* ubhayī kramārpita-dvayāt, 4) *syād* avaktavyā, saḥārpita-dvayāt, 5) *syād* apekṣikī cāvaktavyā ca, tathā niścāyena saḥārpita-dvayāt, 6) *syād* anāpekṣikī cāvaktavyā ca, pūrva-siddhatva-saḥārpita-dvayāt, 7) *syād* ubhayī cāvaktavyā ca, kramākramārpitōbhayāt’ iti sapta-bhaṅgī-prakṛtyām yojayen naya-viśeṣa-vaśād aviruddhām pūrvavat (AS 3, pp. 345–346).

⁹⁸ Krishnaswamy, ‘India’s Language Philosophy’, p. 43.

“According to the Jaina doctrine, however, any entity is composed of infinite attributes which apparently contradict one another. Though *syād-vāda* consists in stating an entity as substantive and its attribute as predicate, yet the attribute in question possesses its counterpart which is apparently contradictory to it; that is, «existence» always postulates «non-existence», and «non-existence» presupposes «existence». Thus the affirmative-negative relation holds between such correlative attributes.”⁹⁹

Kothari explains the role of this theory,

“The role of the complementarity approach and of *Syādvāda* logic is to give a less ambiguous meaning to the terminology of natural language and to provide greater insight into the relationship between human mind and reality.”¹⁰⁰

Marathe points out that Jaina logic accommodates the change of truth values,

“On the plane of things it seems to argue that things or *dravyas* are the only entities that can take contrary *guṇas* on different occasions and yet retain their numerical identity at least which can form basis of reidentification and recognition of them.”¹⁰¹

The method of the sevenfold modal description lays the real potential of language that is capable of describing only limited snippets of reality (the snippet image of the real thing etc.) bare.

The fourth kind of indescribability in the Jain’s view is connected with the fact that a word has a generic form and that is why it is not capable of expressing an individual thing with all its displays. Many issues may be included in a scope of this assertion and they are interrelated with the previous three kinds of indescribability. It does not, however, mean, that an individual is not denoted by a word at all. Samantabhadra for instance refers to the standpoint of the opponents (*anyeṣām*) who think that the speech (*giraḥ*), which has the universals as its designates (*sāmānyārthā*), is not able to denote the individual (*viśeṣo nābhilapyate*), and who simultaneously claim that the universals do not exist (*sāmānyābhāvatas*). For Samantabhadra the consequence of such a perspective is the assertion that the whole verbal activity is false (*mṛṣaiva sakalā giraḥ*) (ĀM 2.31). A word denotes a certain aspect of an object or of a group of objects underlying a limited number of semantic layers. It can refer to a particular object (i.e. *vṛkṣa*, ‘a tree’), to the family of objects (i.e. *vṛkṣatva*, ‘tree-ness’) and to their varieties (i.e. *śimśapatva*, ‘Aśoka

⁹⁹ Uno, *Study of Syād-vāda*, p. 55.

¹⁰⁰ Daulat S. Kothari, ‘The Complementarity Principle and *Syādvāda*’, in: *Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets*, p. 89.

¹⁰¹ M.P. Marathe, ‘An Analysis of ‘Syat’ in *Syādvāda*, *Studies in Jainism*, *Indian Philosophical Quarterly Publication*, ed. M.P. Marathe, Meena A. Kelkar, P.P. Gokhale, 7 (1984), p. 150.

tree-ness'), and then it indicates the genus of the referent and a degree of its generality.¹⁰² Anantavīrya and Prabhācandra devote much space to dispute with Buddhist theory of semantic exclusion (*apoha*), according to which the word 'cow' denotes the 'non-existence of non-cows' (i.e. excludes the word 'non-cow', PĀ 4.1, PKM, pp. 431–444). Their extensive polemic raises the question as to what kind of negation it is: weak (*prasajya-pratiṣedha*) or strong (*paryudāsa-pratiṣedha*). Such a word neither denotes a unique particular (*svalakṣana*) nor individual (*vyakti*). Through the theory of predications and the method of the sevenfold modal description the Jainas underline limitations of language and its units. They have been strengthening their position (expanding it) by constant discussions with representatives of different schools and by refuting their solutions to the problem of the universal-word meaning.

Haribhadra-sūri, expanding the thought of his predecessors, introduces the category of an idea (*buddhi*) in the form of a polemic with the Naiyāyikas in order to link a word and particular objects,

“[The Naiyāyikas:] As the universal is given in experience, it is unbecoming of a born logic to concern themselves with denying the universal, because the effort is fruitless. The situation is as follows: if the real thing, [that is] eternal, permeated by existence [and] partless would not be the real thing as the universal, then the idea and the word would not be different, with regard to clay and the word «clay», [understood] in each case as equivalent with regard to many individuals, such as pot, shallow dish, earthen vessel and bucket, which vary owing to differences in time, place and nature. By no means there is an idea endowed with [only] one form with regard to many things varying in endless ways, [as in the case of] water [referring to] frost, dew [and] hail, fire [referring to] charcoal, burning chaff [and] flame, wind [referring to] hurricane, wind turbine, air wave, [plants referring to] mimosa pudica, ficus glomerata, the fruit of the jujube tree, and there is not only one word [describing all these]. Hence, existence of the universal, which exists as the real thing, which is based on existence of these two [things]: idea and word, which are not different, and as it has been said, should be acknowledged.”¹⁰³

¹⁰² evaṃ ekāntābhilāpyam anupapannam eva, tad-bhāve śabdārthayos tādātmyāpatteḥ. āha – na hy abhyupagamā eva bādhāyai bhavanti, śabdārthayor hi tādātmyam iṣyata eva, tata eva rat-pratīteḥ, vṛkṣatva-śiṃśapātvavat, vṛkṣatva-pratīpatti nāntarīyakā śiṃśapātvā-pratīpattir ity anayos tād-ātmyam (AJP, p. 365).

¹⁰³ āha – anubhava-siddhatvāt sāmānyasya na yujyate sahrdaya-tārkikasya tat-pratikṣepeṇātmanam āyāsaitum, āyāsasya niṣphalatvāt. tathā hi – yadī sanātanaṃ vastu sad-vyāpyekam anavayavaṃ sāmānyā-vastu na syāt, na tadā deśa-kāla-svabhāva-bheda-bhinneṣu ghaṭa-śarāvōṣṭriko-dañcanādiṣu bahuṣu viśeṣeṣu sarvatra mṛd-mṛd-ity-abhinna buddhi-śabdau syātām. na khalu hima-tuṣāra-karako-dakāṅgāra-murmura-jvālānala-jhañjhā-maṅḍalikōtkalikā-pavana-khadīro-dumbara-badarikādiṣv atyanta-bhinneṣu bahuṣu viśeṣeṣv ekākārā buddhir bhavati, nāpy ekākārāḥ śabdhaḥ pravartata iti, ato'sya yathōktābhinna-buddhi-śabda-dvaya-pravṛtti-nibandhanasya vastu-sataḥ sāmānyasya sattvam āśrayitavyam iti (AJP, p. 278).

And the Jainistic response sounds as follows:

“It has been said here: we do not negate this basis, which is the use of these two [things]: idea and word, as it has been said. What comes out of it? But [we negate] the universal as possessing a property of one type, as imagined by the adversary. And just as it (the universal) is not justified without reflection concerning the occurrence of individuals, in the same way it is indicated in portions, and in turn the universal is refuted by the set of arguments such as the unwanted consequence in the form of the conception referring to it (the universal) that there is an incoherence between the lack of occurrence in different things and number – and there is no effort here.”¹⁰⁴

The above quotations may serve as an example of developing and enriching the Jaina viewpoint (a set of categories) through polemics with other Indian philosophical schools.

A reconstruction of the Jaina standpoint in the field of expressibility and describability of the universals and the individuals indicates a complex, relativized image. Language grasps and unveils fragments of reality, without generating the whole description. An occurrence of contradictory qualities is not contradictory to language, because it is a human being that chooses an important aspect. In the process of communication, as the Jaina thinkers state, an individual person is important, and in an exact sense – their intention (*vivakṣā*, *abhiprāya*). Samantabhadra realizes that those, who ‘desire’ to

¹⁰⁴ atrōcyate – na khalv asmābhir yathōkta-buddhi-śabda-dvaya-pravṛtti-nibandhanam niṣidhyate. kiṃ tarhi? ekādi-dharma-yuktaṃ parapari-kalpitaṃ sāmānyam iti. tac ca yathā viśeṣa-vṛtṭy-ayogena na ghaṭāṃ prāñcati tathā leśato nidarśitaṃ eva, prapañcatas tv anyatra vṛtṭy-ayoga-sankhyādi-vyabhicāra-tadvat-pratyaya-prasaṅgādīnā yuktikalāpeṇa nirākṛtaṃ iti nēha prayāsaḥ (AJP, p. 279). And later Haribhadra-sūri continues the discussion: āha – kiṃ punar yathōkta-buddhi-śabda-dvaya-pravṛtti-nibandhanam iti? ucyate – aneka-dharmātmakānām vastūnām tathā-viddhaḥ samāna-pariṇāma iti. na cātra sāmānyavṛtṭi-parikṣōpanyasta-vikalpa-yugala-prabhava-doṣa-sambhavaḥ, samāna-pariṇāmasya tad-vilakṣanavāt, tulya-jñāna-paricchedya-vastu-rūpasya samāna-pariṇāmatvāt, asyaiva ca sāmānyabhāvōpapatteḥ. samānānām bhāvaḥ sāmānyam iti yat tat-samānais tathā bhūyata ity anvartha-yogāt, arthāntara-bhūta-bhāvasya ca tad-vyatirekeṇāpi tat-samānatve’nupayogāt, anyathā samānānām ity abhidhānābhāvād ayuktaiva tat-kalpanā. samānatvaṃ ca bhedāvinābhāvya eva, tad-abhāve sarvathāikatvataḥ samānatvānupapatter iti tathā-vidhaḥ samāna-pariṇāma eva samāna-buddhi-śabda-dvaya-pravṛtti-nimittam (AJP, pp. 279–280). “Hence, what is the combination of these two actions: of the idea and the word. It has been said – similar transformations of the thing [are] endowed with the nature of more than one characteristics. And in this place the nature of error [is] not connected with alleged simultaneousness of concepts that emerge from analysis of the occurrence of the universal, similar transformations certainly [lean on] various characteristics, because the form of the real thing estimated by simultaneous cognitions [leans on] similar transformation, as it achieves the nature of the universal. The universal is the form of similar things, because it is conformable to the meaning «that which is through similar transformations of the thing, it would be in like manner» and because the existence of entities different from the thing is useless in the state of their community of qualities because they are different from this [thing]. Concepts concerning it are not proper, because there is no speech: «otherwise they will be similar». And the state of similarity is necessarily connected with difference, because when it is absent, similarity of the entirety and the singleness is not accomplished, hence similar transformations of such qualities are exactly the cause of similar manifestation of their two: the idea and the world.”

choose certain features of the object (*tais tad-arthibhiḥ*), have the intention to speak of them and not to speak of others (*vivakṣā cāvivakṣā ca*), when some characteristics of ‘the bearer of innumerable marks [capable of being] distinguished’ (*viśeṣye ’nanta-dharmini*) are distinguished and some are not (*sato viśeṣaṇasyâtra nâsatas*) (ĀM 2.35). The person, using their intention (*vivakṣayā*), decides whether certain features are primary (*mukhya*) or secondary (*guṇa*), for instance such features as the difference and the non-difference (*bhedābhedau*), coexisting in one object (*tāv ekatrāvairuddhau te*), being a scope of cognitive criteria (*pramāṇa-gocarau*), and being not fictitious (conventional) (*na samvrtī*) (ĀM 2.36). The detailed analysis of this aspect is available for instance in PKM, pp. 444–453. It is a personal intention, not completely credible, that has an impact upon a choice of the meaning.

Summary

The Jain theory of universals and particulars, pertaining to the concept of the multi-fold reality as such, has an impact upon the way we describe reality through language. Hence, the theory of multidimensionality of reality (*anekānta-vāda*) has formed the basis for reflection on language and in consequence, on how we speak about universals and particulars. The challenge of this kind displays deficiency of language, unveiling its nature, but also induces the search of new instruments arising from the deconstruction of knowledge of its structures and rules.

The problem of the describability of the universals and the particulars, whose classification is quite extensive, is analysed in the Jaina literature at many levels and by different thinkers representing varied viewpoints on the subject as a result of evolution of chief Jaina concepts, such as the sevenfold modal description or the theory of predications, and advancement and intensification of debates with proponents of other systems (especially the Mīmāṃsā, the Nyāya and the Buddhists). The position of each Jaina philosopher should be extensively analysed and respective concepts and points of views should be dealt with in a way that enables us to track their evolution. Each level of the analysis (*śabda/buddhi*, *śabda-bhāvanā/artha-bhāvanā*, *vyañjana-paryāya/artha-paryāya*, *naigama-naya/saṃgraha-naya*, *sakalādeśa/vikalādeśa*, *vidhi/vidhi-niyama/niyama*, *vastutā/avastutā*, *vidhi/niśedha*, *syāt asti/na asti/avaktavyam*, *vivakṣā/avivakṣā*) refers to a different kinds of filters imposed by a cognizing subject on a described fragment of reality (object, relation, context). All of them are describable to some extent. The perspective of the human mind (its restrictions, predilection, choices) that has to manage with the complex, defined multiverse is important here.

A distinct issue, not tackled in the present paper, is the role of memory in storing data concerning things (images of particulars, universal concepts etc.)¹⁰⁵ and the question

¹⁰⁵ The problem of memory (*smṛti*) in the reference to the universal and the particular has been raised in AS, pp. 130–134, AJP, pp. 140–190.

whether memory, as the reservoir of images of objects, preserves words that would have power of describing them.

The universals and the particulars, as real, can be conceptualised and communicated with the help of proper tools, but they can never be analysed in isolation from their reversed instances and they cannot lead to recurrent abstractions or accumulations of concepts implying the reification of the unreal.

References

- AJP = Haribhadra-sūri: *Anekānta-jaya-patākā*, ed. Hiralal R. Kapadia, *Anekāntajayapatākā by Haribhadra Sūri with His Own Commentary and Muncandra Sūri's Supercommentary*, 2 Vols., Gaekwad's Oriental Series 88, 105, Oriental Institute, Baroda 1940, 1947².
- ĀM = Samantabhadra: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*. Samantabhadra's *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*. *Critique of An Authority [Along with English Translation, Introduction, Notes and Akalaṅka's Sanskrit Commentary Aṣṭaśatī]*, ed., trans. Nagin J. Shah, Sanskrit-Sanskriti Granthamālā 7, Ahmedabad 1999.
- AṣS = Vidyānanda Pātrakesarisvāmin: *Aṣṭa-sahasrī*. D.L. ed. Darbārī L. Koṭhiyā; Brahmācārī S. Jain, *Tārkika-śiromaṇi ācārya vidyānanda-kṛtra Aṣṭa-sahasrī*. *Jaina-vidyā Saṁsthāna, Digambara Jaina Atiśaya Kṣetra, Śrīmahāvīrajī*, 1997.
- AṣŚ = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā-aṣṭaśatī*, in: Samantabhadra: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, ed. Pannālāl Jain, *Ācārya-śrī-samantabhadra-svāmi-vīracitā Āpta-mīmāṃsā syād-vāda-vidyāpati-śrī-vidyānanda-svāmi-vīracitā pramāṇa-parīkṣā ca*, Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā 7, 8, Kāśī, 1914. On the basis of the bibliography in: Piotr Balcerowicz, 'On the Relative Chronology of Dharmakīrti and Samantabhadra', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 44/ 3 (2016), pp. 437–483.
- DNC = Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa: *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra*, ed. Muni Jambūvijayajī, *Dvādaśāraṇa Nayacakram of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādī Kṣamāśramaṇa*. *With the commentary Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Ācārya Śrī Siṃhasūri Gaṇi Vādī Kṣamāśramaṇa*, Part 1, Śrī-Jaina-Ātmānaṃda-sabhā, Bhāvnagar 1966, 2000²; Part 2, Bhāvnagar 1976, Part 3, Bhāvnagar 1988.
- DS = Nemichandra Siddhanta Chakravarti: *Dravya-saṁgraha*, ed. Saratchandra Ghoshal, *Dravya-saṁgraha*. Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi 1989.
- LT = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Laghīyas-traya*, ed. Mahendra K. Shastri, *Akalaṅka-grantha-traya*, Singhi Jain Series 12, Sañcālaka-singhī Jaina Grantha-mālā, Ahmedabad 1939.
- LTS = Amṛtachandra-sūri: *Laghu-tattva-sphoṭa*, ed. Dalsukh Malvania, Nagin J. Shah, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1978.
- LTV = cf. LT.
- NA = Siddhasena Mahāmatī: *Nyāyāvātāra*, ed., trans., Piotr Balcerowicz, *Jaina Epistemology in Historical and Comparative Perspective. Critical Edition and English Translation of Logical-Epistemological Treatises: Nyāyāvātāra, Nyāyāvātāra-vivṛti and Nyāyāvātāra-tippāna with Introduction and Notes*, Vol. 1–2, Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi, 2008.
- NV = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Nyāya-viniścaya*, ed. Mahendra K. Shastri, *Akalaṅka-grantha-traya*, Singhi Jain Series 12, Sañcālaka-singhī Jaina Grantha-mālā, Ahmedabad 1939.
- PĀ = Māṇikyanandin: *Parīkṣāmukha*, ed. Ramaprasada Jain, 1992. Cf. PĀLV and PKM.
- PĀLV = Anantavīrya: *Parīkṣāmukha-laghu-vṛtti*. *Prameyaratnamālā Śrīmat Laghu Anantavīrya vīracitā, hindi vyākhyā*, ed. Ramaprasada Jain, M. Bhāratavarṣīya Anekānta Vidvat Paṛiśad, Datīyā 1992.
- PASāTD = Amṛtachandra-sūri: *Pañcāstikāya-sāra-tattva-dīpikā*, ed. Manoharlāl, *Śrīmat-Kundakunda-svāmi-vīracitaḥ Pañcāsti-kāyaḥ Tattva-pradīpikā-tātparyā-vṛtti-bālāvabodhaka-bhāṣeṭi īkā-trayōpetaḥ*, Śrī Paramaśruta-Prabhāvaka-maṇḍal, Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama, Agās 1970.
- PASU = Amritachandra-sūri: *Puruṣārtha-siddhy-upāya*. *Realisation of the Pure Self. With Hindi and English Translation*, ed., trans. Vijay K. Jain, Vikalp Printers, Dehradun 2012.

- PKM = Prabhācandra: *Prameya-kamala-mārtaṇḍa*, ed. Mahendra K. Shastri, Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series, Sri Satguru Publications, Delhi, 1990.
- PP = Umāsvāti: *Praśamarati-prakaraṇa*, crit. ed., trans. Y.S. Shastri, ed. R.S. Betai, Y.S. Shastri, L.D. Series 107, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 9, 1989.
- PPt = Vijayakīrti Yaśasūri: *Pārśva-prabhā-ṭika*, in: *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇam (bhāgā 2 arvācīnavibhāga)*. *Pārśva-prabhā-ṭikā-chayā-anvayārtha-gāthārtha-tātparyārtha-rājītam*. Pū. ā. Śrī Vijayarāmacandrasūri-smṛti – saṃskṛta – prakṛta – granthamālā – kramāṅga 26 (ISBN 978-81-87163-59-6).
- PSāTD = Amṛtacandra-sūri: *Pravacana-sāra-tattva-dīpikā*, in: *Śrī Kundakūṇḍacārya's Pravacanasāra (Pavayaṇasāra), a Pro-Canonical Text of the Jainas, the Prakṛit Text critically edited with the Sanskrit Commentaries of Amṛtacandra and Jayasena*, ed. Adinath N. Upadhye, Śrī Paramāśruta-Prabhāvaka-Maṇḍala, Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama, Agās 1984.
- PSV = Diñnāga: *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti*, ed. Ole H. Pind, *Dignāga's Philosophy of Language. Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti on anyāpoha. Part I and Part II*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Verlag 2015.
- RVār = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Tattvārtha-vārtikam [rāja-vārtikam]*. *Hindī anuvāda sahita*, ed. Mahendra K. Jain. Kāśī, Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Vārāṇasī, Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, 1953.
- SŚP = Vidyānanda: *Satya-śāsana-parīkṣā*, ed. Gokul C. Jain, *Vidyānandi-kṛta-Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā*, Jnanapitha Murtidevi Jain Granthamala Sanskrit Grantha no. 30, Varanasi 1964.
- STM = Vijaya Darśana-sūri: *Sammati-tarka-mahārṇavāvatārikā*, Madrāsa-nagara-sthā Jaina-mārga-prabhāvaka sabhā, Śrī nemi saṃ 8 – vikramādva 2013 – śrīvīrādva 2483.
- STP = Siddhasena Divākara: *Sammati-tarka with a Critical Introduction and an Original Commentary by S. Saṅghavi, B. Doshi*, trans. A.B. Athavle, A.S. Gopani, ed. Dalsukh Malvania, Shri Jain Shwetambar Education Board, Bombay 1939.
- STS = Siddhasena Divākaram, Abhayadeva-sūri: *Sammati-tattva-sopānam (Siddhasena Divākara's Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇam alongside Abhayadeva-sūri's Tattva-bodhi-nivṛtti)*, Shri Labdha-surishvara Jaina Granthamala, Baroda, 1946.
- SVM = Malliṣeṇa-sūri: *Syād-vāda-mañjari*, in: *The Flower-Spray of the Quodammodo Doctrine*, trans. F.W. Thomas, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Varanasi, Patna 1968.
- TS = Umāsvāmi/Umāsvāti: *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, ed. Shugan C. Jain, Jainism, *Key to Reality*, trans., Shugan C. Jain, Jambudweep, Hastinapur, Digambar Jain Trilok Shodh Sansthan 2011.
- TSṭ = Gandhahastin Siddhasena-gaṇin: *Tattvārtha-sūtra-ṭikā*, in: *Tattvārthādighigama-ṭikā*, ed. Hiralal R. Kapadia, *Tattvārthādighigamasūtra (A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Jainism) by His Holiness Śrī Umāsvāti Vāchaka, together with His connective verses commented upon by Śrī Devaguptasūri & Śrī Siddhasenagaṇi and His own gloss elucidated by Śrī Siddhasenagaṇi, edited with Introduction in English and Sanskrit*. 2 Vols., Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakodhar Fund Series Nos. 67 and 76, Jivanachand Sakerchand Javeri, Part 1, Bombay 1926, Part 2, Bombay 1930. On the basis of the bibliography in: Piotr Balcerowicz, 'On the Relative Chronology of Dharmakīrti and Samantabhadra', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 44/3 (2016), pp. 437–483.
- YA = Samantabhadra: *Yukty-anuśāsana*, in: *Śrīmat-samantabhadrācārya-praṇītaṃ Yukty-anuśāsanam. Śrī-vidyānandācārya-viracitayā ṭikayā saṃvantivaṃ*, ed. Indra Lal, Māṇikacandra-Digambara-Jaina-Grantha-Mālā, Nāthūrām Premī Maṃṭri, Māṇikacandra-Digambara-Jaina-Grantha-mālā-samiti, Saṃ.: 1977.
- Armstrong David M., *A Combinatorial Theory of Possibility*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1989.
- Armstrong David M., *A World of States of Affairs*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1997.
- Arnold Dan, *Brains, Buddhas, and Believing: The Problem of Intentionality in Classical Buddhist and Cognitive-Scientific Philosophy of Mind*, Columbia University Press, New York 2012.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, 'Jak uczynić z krowy byt diachronicznie i synchronicznie homogeniczny, czyli o pojęciach *urdhvata-samānya* i *tiraścina-samānya*' ['How to make a cow a synchronically and diachronically

- homogenous entity, or on the notions of urdhvata-samanya and tirascina-samanya’], *Studia Indologiczne* 5 (1998), pp. 22–60.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘How could a cow be both synchronically and diachronically homogenous, or on the Jaina notions of tiryak-samanya and urdhvata-samanya’, in: *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols. [Proceedings of the International Conference on Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols, 31.03–2.04.1995 Toronto]*, ed. Narendra K. Wagle, Olle Qvarnström, SASP 11, Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto 1999, pp. 211–237, <<http://www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/Balcerowicz1999b.pdf>>, pp. 1–29.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘The Logical Structure of the Naya Method of the Jainas’. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29/3 (2001), pp. 379–403, <<http://www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/Balcerowicz2001b.pdf>>.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘Some Remarks on the Naya Method’, in: *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion [Proceedings of the International Seminar on Jainism ‘Aspects of Jainism’, Warsaw University 8th–9th September, 2000]*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2003, pp. 37–67, <www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/balcerowicz2003a.pdf>.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, *Historia klasycznej filozofii indyjskiej. Część pierwsza: początki, nurty analityczne i filozofia przyrody*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog, Warszawa 2003.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘Pramanas and language. A Dispute between Dignaga, Dharmakirti and Akalanka’, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 33/4 (2005), pp. 343–400, <www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/balcerowicz2005c.pdf>.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘What Exists for the Vaisesika?’, in: *Logic and Belief in Indian Philosophy*, ed. Piotr Balcerowicz (ed.), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2010, pp. 241–348, <www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/What_Exists_for_the_Vaisesika.pdf>.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘Introduction: On Attempts to Formalise the Syadvada’, in: *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. XVII: *Jaina Philosophy*, ed. Piotr Balcerowicz, Karl H. Potter, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2014, pp. 29–51, <www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/balcerowicz2014a.pdf>.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘Do attempts to formalise the syad-vada make sense’, in: *Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy*, ed. Peter Flügel & Olle Qvarnström, Routledge, London–New York 2015, pp. 181–248.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, ‘Siddhasena Mahamati and Akalanka Bhaṭṭa: A Revolution in Jaina Epistemology’, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* (14 October 2015), pp. 1–47, first draft: <www.balcerowicz.eu/indology/balcerowicz2016a.pdf>.
- Balcerowicz Piotr, Potter Karl H. (ed.), *Jain Philosophy*, part 2, in: *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. 14. Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi 2013.
- Bales Eugene F., *A Ready Reference to Philosophy East and West*, University Press of America 1987.
- Bartley Christopher J., *The Theology of Ramanuja: Realism and Religion*, Routledge, New York 2013.
- Bharuch Filita, Kamat R.V., ‘Syādvāda Theory of Jainism in Terms of a Deviant Logic’, in: *Encyclopaedia of Jainism*, Vol. 24, ed. Nagendra K. Singh, Indo-european Jain Rearch Foundation, Delhi, & Anmol Publications PVT. LTD., New Delhi 2001, pp. 6299–6302.
- Bhattacharya Ramkrishna, ‘Syādvāda in the View of Three Modern Scientists’, *Jain Journal. A Quarterly on Jainology* XXXV/1 (2000), pp. 19–22.
- Bhattacharya Ramshankar, Larson G.J., Potter Karl H., *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Samkhya*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1987.
- Borghini Andrea, *A Critical Introduction to the Metaphysics of Modality*, London–New York, Bloomsbury 2016.
- Bossche Frank van den, ‘Existence and non-existence in Haribhadra Sūri’s Anekānta-jaya-patākā’, *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Iss. 4 (1995), pp. 429–468.
- Chattopadhyaya Debiprasad, *Lokāyata. A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism*, Peoples’s Publishing House, New Delhi 1992.
- Datta Dharendra M., *The Six Ways of Knowing: A Critical Study of the Advaita Theory of Knowledge*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1997.
- Daye Douglas D., ‘Circularity in the Inductive Justification of Formal Arguments (tarka) in Twelfth Century Indian Jaina Logic, Studies in Indian Philosophy’, in: *A Memorial Volume in Honour of Pandit*

- Sukhlalji Sanghvi*, ed. Dalsukh Malvania, Nagin J. Shah, L.D. Series, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1981, pp. 105–124.
- Dixit Krishna K., *Jaina Ontology*, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1971.
- Dravid Raja R., *The Problem of Universals in Indian Philosophy*, ed. K. Ram, Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi 2000.
- Eltschinger Vincent et al., *Dharmakīrti's theory of exclusion (apoha). Part 1, On concealing: an annotated translation of Pramāṇavārtikasvavṛtti 24,16–45,20 (Pramāṇavārtika 1.40–91)*, The International Institute for Buddhist Studies 2018.
- Goyal S., 'Syādvāda and Intentional Fallacy: A Comparative Study', *Tulsī Prajñā, Jain Vishva Bharati University. Research Quarterly* 154 (2012), pp. 35–41.
- Grimes John A., *An Advaita Vedanta Perspective on Language*, Studies in Indian Tradition No. 3, Delhi 1991.
- Grimes John A., *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy: Sanskrit Terms Defined in English*, SUNY Press 1996.
- Jain Bhagchandra, 'Rudiments of Anekāntavāda in Early Pāli Literature', in: *Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda)*, ed. Nagin J. Shah, Motilal Banarsidass Publisher Private Limited & Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology, Delhi 2000, pp. 119–126.
- Jain Sagarmal, *The Jain Philosophy of Language*, Parshwanath Vidyapeeth Series No. 145. Vardhamana Mudranalaya, Jawahar Nagar, Varanasi 2006.
- Jain Jyoti P., *Religion and Culture of the Jains*, Bharatiya Jnanpith, Delhi 2010.
- Jhaveri Indukala H., *The Sāṅkhya-yoga and the Jain: Theories of Parināma*, Gujarat University 1990.
- Jindal K.B. (ed.), *The Prefaces*, K.B. Jindal 1958.
- Katsura Shōryū, 'Jñānaśrīmitra on Apoha', in: *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology. Studies in the Buddhist Analysis of Inference and Language*, ed. Bimal K. Matilal, Robert D. Evans, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster, Tokyo 1986, pp. 188–201.
- Knuutila Simo, 'Medieval Modern Theories And Modal Logic', in: *Handbook of the History of Logic. Mediaeval and Renaissance Logic*, Vol. 2, ed. Dov M. Gabbay and John Woods, North Holland, Elsevier, Amsterdam 2008, pp. 505–578.
- Kothari Daulat S., *The Complementarity Principle and Syādvāda, Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda)*, Motilal Banarsidass Publisher Private Limited & Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology, Delhi 2000, pp. 87–95.
- Krishnaswamy Natesan, 'India's Language Philosophy', *Tulsī Prajñā, Jain Vishva Bharati University. Research Quarterly* 150 (2011), pp. 11–48.
- Kulkarni Vitthal M., *Relativity and Absolutism, Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda)*, ed. Nagin J. Shah, Motilal Banarsidass Publisher Private Limited & Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology, Delhi 2000, pp. 61–66.
- Malvania Dalsukh and Soni Jayendra, *Jain Philosophy*, Part 1, in: *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. 10, Motilal Banarsidass Publ. Jain Philosophy, Delhi 2007.
- Marathe, M.P., 'An Analysis of 'Syat' in Syādvāda, Studies in Jainism', *Indian Philosophical Quarterly Publication*, M.P. Marathe, Meena A. Kelkar, P.P. Gokhale(ed.), 7 (1984), pp. 141–155.
- Matilal Bimal K., *The Central Philosophy of Jainism (Anekānta-vāda)*, L.D. Series 79, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1981.
- Matilal Bimal K., 'Buddhist Logic and Epistemology', in: *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology. Studies in the Buddhist Analysis of Inference and Language*, ed. Bimal K. Matilal, Robert D. Evans, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands 1986, pp. 1–30.
- McAllister Patrick, *Ranakīrti's Proof of Exclusion*, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 98, 2020.
- Mills Ethan, *Three Pillars of Skepticism in Classical India: Nagarjuna, Jayarasi, and Sri Harsa*, Rowman & Littlefield 2018.
- Mishra Rajnish K., *Buddhist Theory of Meaning and Literary Analysis*, Emerging Perceptions in Buddhist Studies, No. 10, D.K. Printworld (P) Ltd., Delhi 1999.

- Monier-Williams Monier, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi 2005.
- Mukerji R.N., 'The Jaina Logic of Seven-fold Predication', in: *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, ed. Adinath N. Upadhye, Nathmal Tatia, Dalsukh Malvania, Mohanlal Mehta, Nemighand Shastri, Kailashchandra Shastri, Bhagavān Mahāvīra 2,500 Nirvāṇa Mahotsava Samiti, Bombay 1977, pp. 225–233.
- Mumford Stephen, *David Armstrong*, Routledge, New York 2007.
- Mumford Stephen (ed.), *Russell on Metaphysics: Selections from the Writings of Bertrand Russell*, Routledge, New York 2003, pp. 123–142.
- Nair Rama, *Indian Theories of Language, a Literary Approach*, Cauvery Publications 1990.
- Padmarajiah Yelekyatharahalli J., *A Comparative Study of the Jaina Theories of Reality and Knowledge*, Jain Sahitya Vikas Mandal, Bombay 1963.
- Patnaik Tandra, *Śabda: A Study of Bharṭṛhari's Philosophy of Language*, D.K. Print World (P) Limited, Delhi 1994.
- Pind Ole H., *Dignāga's Philosophy of Language. Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti on anyāpoha. Part I and Part II*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2015.
- Raja K. Kununjuni, 'Buddhist and Mīmāṃsā Views on Lakṣaṇa', in: Ram K. Śarmā, *Researches in Indian and Buddhist Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Professor Alex Wayman*, Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi 1993.
- Ram-Prasad Chakravarthi, *Indian Philosophy and the Consequences of Knowledge: Themes in Ethics, Metaphysics and Soteriology*, Routledge, New York 2016.
- Schneider Susan, 'Alien Individuals, Alien Universals, and Armstrong's Combinatorial Theory of Possibility', *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* XXXIX (2001), pp. 575–593.
- Shastri Davendra M., *A Source-Book in Jaina Philosophy*, trans. T.D. Kalghatgi, ed. T.S. Devodoss, Sri Tarak Guru Jain Granthalaya, Udaipur 1983.
- Sider Theodore, 'Bare Particulars', *Philosophical Perspectives* 20 (2006), pp. 387–397.
- Soni Jayendra, *Kundakunda, Umāsvāti and Siddhasena Divākara. Jaina philosophy*, doi:10.4324/9780415249126-F005-1, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Taylor and Francis, London 1998, Visited 09 June 2020, <<https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/overview/jaina-philosophy/v-1/sections/kundakunda-umasvati-and-siddhasena-divakara>>.
- Soni Jayendra, 'Dravya, guṇa and paryāya in Jaina thought', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 19 (1991), pp. 75–88.
- Thomas Holly G. , 'Combinatorialism and Primitive Modality', *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* 83/3 (1996), pp. 231–252.
- Trikha Himal, *Composition Areas in Vidyānandin's Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā: The First Part of the uttarapakṣa in the Chapter on Vaiśeṣika*, Viewed 30 January 2017, <<http://www.academia.edu/458024/>>.
- Uno Atsushi, *A Study of Syād-vāda (With a special reference to Syādvādamañjarī)*, in: *Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda)*, ed. Nagin J. Shah, Motilal Banarsidass Publisher Private Limited & Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology, Delhi 2000, pp. 33–60.
- Upadhye Adinath N. et al. (ed.), *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, Bhagavān Mahāvīra 2500th Nirvāṇa Mahotsava Samiti 1977.

The article is funded by National Science Centre, Poland, under the project Preludium 7, no. UMO2014/13/N/HS1/01061 entitled "Jaina Philosophy of Language in Classical Period (5th–10th c. CE) and Its Epistemological and Ontological Implications" (under the supervision of prof. Piotr Balcerowicz).