

# Anekantavada

**Anekāntavāda** ([Sanskrit](#): [अनेकान्तवाद](#), "many-sidedness") refers to the [Jain](#) doctrine about metaphysical truths that emerged in ancient [India](#).<sup>[1]</sup> It states that the ultimate truth and reality is complex, has multiple aspects.<sup>[2]</sup> Anekantavada has also been interpreted to mean non-absolutism, "intellectual Ahimsa",<sup>[3]</sup> religious pluralism,<sup>[4]</sup> as well as a rejection of fanaticism that leads to terror attacks and mass violence.<sup>[5]</sup>

According to [Jainism](#), no single, specific statement can describe the nature of existence and the [absolute truth](#). This knowledge (*Kevala Jnana*), it adds, is comprehended only by the [Arihants](#). Other beings and their statements about absolute truth are incomplete, and at best a partial truth.<sup>[6]</sup> Anekāntavāda is a fundamental doctrine of Jainism.

The origins of *anekāntavāda* can be traced back to the teachings of [Mahāvīra](#) (599–527 [BCE](#)), the 24th Jain [Tirthankara](#).<sup>[7]</sup> The [dialectical](#) concepts of *syādvāda* "conditioned viewpoints" and *nayavāda* "partial viewpoints" arose from *anekāntavāda* in the medieval era, providing Jainism with more detailed logical structure and expression. The details of the doctrine emerged in Jainism in the 1st millennium CE, from debates between scholars of Jain, Buddhist and Hindu schools of philosophies.<sup>[8]</sup>

The principle of *anekāntavāda* was one of the ancient principles that influenced [Mahatma Gandhi](#).<sup>[9]</sup><sup>[*page needed*]</sup>

The word *anekāntavāda* is a compound of two [Sanskrit](#) words: *anekānta* and *vāda*. The word *anekānta* itself is composed of three root words, "an" (not), "eka" (one) and "anta" (end, side), together it connotes "not one ended, sided", "many-sidedness", or "manifoldness".<sup>[10][11][12]</sup> The word *vāda* means "doctrine, way, speak, thesis".<sup>[13][14]</sup> The term *anekāntavāda* is translated by scholars as the doctrine of "many-sidedness",<sup>[15][16]</sup> "non-onesidedness",<sup>[17]</sup> or "many pointedness".<sup>[18]</sup>

The term *anekāntavāda* is not found in early texts considered canonical by Shwetambara tradition of Jainism (denied by Digambara tradition as canonical). However, traces of the doctrines are found in comments of Mahavira in these Shwetambara texts, where he states that the finite and infinite depends on one's perspective. The word anekantavada was coined by Acharya Siddhasen Divakar to significant the teaching of Mahavira that truth can be expressed in infinite ways. The earliest comprehensive teachings of anekāntavāda doctrine is found in the [Tattvarthasutra](#) of Umasvati, and is considered to be authoritative by all Jain sects. In the Digambara tradition texts. The 'two-truths theory' of Kundakunda also provides the core of this doctrine.<sup>[18]</sup>

The Jain doctrine of *Anekantavada*, also known as *Anekantatva*, states that truth and



reality is complex and always has multiple aspects. Reality can be experienced, but it is not possible to totally express it with language. Human attempts to communicate is *Naya*, or "partial expression of the truth".<sup>[10][11]</sup> Language is not Truth, but a means and attempt to express Truth. From Truth, according to Mahavira, language returns and not the other way around.<sup>[10][19]</sup> One can experience the truth of a taste, but cannot fully express that taste through language. Any attempts to express the experience is *syāt*, or valid "in some respect" but it still remains a "perhaps, just one perspective, incomplete".<sup>[19]</sup> In the same way, spiritual truths are complex, they have multiple aspects, language cannot express their plurality, yet through effort and appropriate karma they can be experienced.<sup>[10]</sup>

The *Anekantavada* premises of the Jains is ancient, as evidenced by its mention in Buddhist texts such as the *Samaññaphala Sutta*. The Jain Agamas suggest that Mahavira's approach to answering all metaphysical philosophical questions was a "qualified yes" (*syāt*).<sup>[20][21]</sup> These texts identify *Anekantavada* doctrine to be one of the key differences between the teachings of the Mahavira and those of the Buddha. The Buddha taught the Middle Way, rejecting extremes of the answer "it is" or "it is not" to metaphysical questions. The Mahavira, in contrast, taught his followers to accept both "it is" and "it is not", with "perhaps" qualification and with reconciliation to understand the Absolute Reality.<sup>[22]</sup> *Syādvāda* (predication [logic](#)) and *Nayavāda* (perspective [epistemology](#)) of Jainism expand on the concept of *anekāntavāda*. *Syādvāda* recommends the expression of *anekānta* by prefixing the epithet *syād* to every phrase or expression describing the nature of existence.<sup>[23][24]</sup>

The Jain doctrine of *Anekantavada*, according to Bimal Matilal, states that "no philosophic or metaphysical proposition can be true if it is asserted without any condition or limitation".<sup>[25]</sup> For a metaphysical proposition to be true, according to Jainism, it must include one or more conditions (*syadvada*) or limitations (*nayavada*, standpoints).<sup>[26]</sup>

## Syādvāda [Edit](#)

*Syādvāda* ([Sanskrit](#): स्याद्वाद) is the theory of *conditioned predication*, the first part of which is derived from the Sanskrit word *syāt* ([Sanskrit](#): स्यात्), which is the third person singular of the optative tense of the Sanskrit verb *as* ([Sanskrit](#): अस्), 'to be', and which becomes *syād* when followed by a vowel or a voiced consonant, in accordance with *sandhi*. The optative tense in Sanskrit (formerly known as the 'potential') has the same meaning as the present tense of the subjunctive mood in most Indo-European languages, including Hindi, Latin, Russian, French, etc. It is used when there is uncertainty in a statement; not 'it is', but 'it may be', 'one might', etc. The subjunctive is very commonly used in Hindi, for example, in 'kya kahun?', 'what to say?'. The subjunctive is also commonly used in conditional constructions; for example, one of the few English locutions in the subjunctive which remains more or less current is 'were

it °, then °', or, more commonly, 'if it were..', where 'were' is in the past tense of the subjunctive.

'Syat' has its own entry as an indeclinable word both in Apte's and in Monier-William's dictionaries - though it is noted that by Apte that this is (*Strictly 3rd. pers. sing. of the Potential of अस् 'to be'*) and similar words by MW. It appears that the lexicographers are conflicted as to whether 'syat' really ranks as a separate word. In Monier-William's dictionary it is defined as "perchance, may be, perhaps". The use of the verb 'as' in the optative tense is found in the more ancient Vedic era literature in a similar sense. For example, sutra 1.4.96 of [Panini](#)'s Astadhyayi explains it as signifying "a chance, may be, probable".<sup>[27]</sup>

In Jainism, however, *syadvada* and *anekanta* is not a theory of uncertainty, doubt or relative probabilities. Rather, it is "conditional yes or conditional approval" of any proposition, state Matilal and other scholars.<sup>[27][28]</sup> This usage has historic precedents in classical Sanskrit literature, and particularly in other ancient Indian religions (Buddhism and Hinduism) with the phrase *syad etat*, meaning "let it be so, but", or "an answer that is 'neither yes nor no', provisionally accepting an opponent's viewpoint for a certain premise". This would be expressed in archaic English with the subjunctive: 'be it so', a direct translation of *syad etat*. Traditionally, this debate methodology was used by Indian scholars to acknowledge the opponent's viewpoint, but disarm and bound its applicability to certain context and persuade the opponent of aspects not considered.<sup>[27][29]</sup>

According to Charitrapragya, in Jain context *syadvada* does not mean a doctrine of doubt or skepticism, rather it means "multiplicity or multiple possibilities".<sup>[28]</sup> *Syat* in Jainism connotes something different from what the term means in Buddhism and Hinduism. In Jainism, it does not connote an answer that is "neither yes nor no", but it connotes a "many sidedness" to any proposition with a seven fold predication.<sup>[29]</sup>

*Syādvāda* is a theory of qualified predication, states Koller. It states that all knowledge claims must be qualified in many ways, because reality is many-sided.<sup>[30]</sup> It is done so systematically in later Jain texts through *saptibhaṅgīnāya* or "[the theory of sevenfold scheme](#)".<sup>[30]</sup> These *saptibhaṅgī* seem to have been first formulated in Jainism by the 5th or 6th century CE Svetambara scholar Mallavadin,<sup>[31]</sup> and they are:<sup>[29][32][33]</sup>

1. Affirmation: *syād-asti*—in some ways, it is,
2. Denial: *syān-nāsti*—in some ways, it is not,
3. Joint but successive affirmation and denial: *syād-asti-nāsti*—in some ways, it is, and it is not,
4. Joint and simultaneous affirmation and denial: *syād-asti-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is, and it is indescribable,
5. Joint and simultaneous affirmation and denial: *syān-nāsti-avaktavyaḥ*—in some

ways, it is not, and it is indescribable,

6. Joint and simultaneous affirmation and denial: *syād-asti-nāsti-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is, it is not, and it is indescribable,
7. Joint and simultaneous affirmation and denial: *syād-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is indescribable.

Each of these seven predicates state the Jain viewpoint of a multifaceted reality from the perspective of time, space, substance and mode.<sup>[29][32]</sup> The phrase *syāt* declares the standpoint of expression – affirmation with regard to own substance (*dravya*), place (*kṣetra*), time (*kāla*), and being (*bhāva*), and negation with regard to other substance (*dravya*), place (*kṣetra*), time (*kāla*), and being (*bhāva*). Thus, for a 'jar', in regard to substance (*dravya*) – earthen, it simply is; wooden, it simply is not. In regard to place (*kṣetra*) – room, it simply is; terrace, it simply is not.<sup>[34]</sup> In regard to time (*kāla*) – summer, it simply is; winter, it simply is not. In regard to being (*bhāva*) – brown, it simply is; white, it simply is not. And the word 'simply' has been inserted for the purpose of excluding a sense not approved by the 'nuance'; for avoidance of a meaning not intended.<sup>[34]</sup>

According to [Samantabhadra](#)'s text *Āptamīmāṃsā* (Verse 105), "*Syādvāda*, the doctrine of conditional predications, and *kevalajñāna* (omniscience), are both illuminators of the substances of reality. The difference between the two is that while *kevalajñāna* illumines directly, *syādvāda* illumines indirectly".<sup>[35]</sup> *Syadvada* is indispensable and helps establish the truth, according to Samantabhadra.<sup>[36]</sup>

## Nayavāda [Edit](#)

*Nayavāda* ([Sanskrit](#): नयवाद) is the theory of standpoints or viewpoints. *Nayavāda* is a compound of two [Sanskrit](#) words—*naya* ("standpoint, viewpoint, interpretation") and *vāda* ("doctrine, thesis").<sup>[37]</sup> *Nayas* are philosophical perspective about a particular topic, and how to make proper conclusions about that topic.<sup>[38]</sup>

According to Jainism, there are seven *nayas* or viewpoints through which one can make complete judgments about absolute reality using *syadvada*.<sup>[39]</sup> These seven *naya*, according to [Umaswati](#), are:<sup>[38][40]</sup>

1. Naigama-naya: common sense or a universal view
2. Samgraha-naya: generic or class view that classifies it
3. Vyavahara-naya: pragmatic or a particular view assesses its utility
4. Rijusutra-naya: linear view considers it in present time
5. Sabda-naya: verbal view that names it
6. Samabhirudha-naya: etymological view uses the name and establishes its nature
7. Evambhuta-naya: actuality view considers its concrete particulars

The *naya* theory emerged after about the 5th century CE, and underwent extensive

development in Jainism. There are many variants of *nayavada* concept in later Jain texts.<sup>[38][39]</sup>

A particular viewpoint is called a *naya* or a partial viewpoint. According to Vijay Jain, *Nayavada* does not deny the attributes, qualities, modes and other aspects; but qualifies them to be from a particular perspective. A *naya* reveals only a part of the totality, and should not be mistaken for the whole. A synthesis of different viewpoints is said to be achieved by the doctrine of conditional predications (*syādvāda*).<sup>[41]</sup>

## Jiva, the changing soul [Edit](#)

-  
Mahāvīra did not use the word *anekāntavada*, but his teachings contain the seeds of the concept (painting from [Rajasthan](#), ca. 1900)

Ancient India, particularly the centuries in which the Mahavira and the Buddha lived, were one of intense intellectual debates, especially on the nature of reality and self or soul. Jain view of soul differs from those found in ancient Buddhist and Hindu texts, and Jain view about *jīva* and *ajīva* (self, matter) utilizes *anekantavada*.<sup>[42][43][44]</sup>

The [Upanishadic](#) thought (Hindu) postulated the impermanence of matter and body, but the existence of an unchanging, eternal metaphysical reality of [Brahman](#) and [Ātman](#) (soul, self). The Buddhist thought also postulated impermanence, but denied the existence of any unchanging, eternal soul or self and instead posited the concept of [anatta](#) (no-self).<sup>[45][46][47]</sup> The Jain thought accepted impermanence as well, but stated that the concept of "changing eternal jiva (soul, self)" thereby stating the jiva to be a substance and a process.<sup>[48][49]</sup> In Jaina thought, there are infinite eternal *jīvas*, predominantly all of which are in their cycles of rebirth ever changing by accumulating or destroying their karmic particles, and a few who have liberated themselves through an ascetic life and become *siddhas*.<sup>[50]</sup>

## Inclusivist or exclusivist [Edit](#)

Some Indian writers state that Anekantavada is an inclusivist doctrine positing that Jainism accepts "non-Jain teachings as partial versions of truth", a form of sectarian tolerance. Others scholars state this is incorrect and a reconstruction of Jain history because Jainism has consistently seen itself in "exclusivist term as the one true path".<sup>[51]</sup> Classical Jain scholars saw their premises and models of reality as superior than the competing spiritual traditions of Buddhism and Hinduism, both of which Jainism considered inadequate. For instance, the Jain text *Uttaradhyayana Sutra* in section 23.63 calls the competing Indian thought to be "heterodox and heretics" and that they "have chosen a wrong path, the right path is that taught by the [Jinas](#)".<sup>[51]</sup> Similarly, the early Jain scholar Haribhadra, who likely lived between the 6th and 8th century, states that those who do not follow the teachings of Jainism cannot be "approved or

accommodated".<sup>[52]</sup>

John Koller states *anekāntavāda* to be "epistemological respect for view of others" about the nature of existence whether it is "inherently enduring or constantly changing", but "not relativism; it does not mean conceding that all arguments and all views are equal".<sup>[53]</sup>

In contemporary times, according to Paul Dundas, the *Anekantavada* doctrine has been interpreted by some Jains as intending to "promote a universal religious tolerance", and a teaching of "plurality" and "benign attitude to other [ethical, religious] positions". This is problematic and a misreading of Jain historical texts and Mahavira's teachings, states Dundas.<sup>[54]</sup> The "many pointedness, multiple perspective" teachings of the Mahavira is a doctrine about the nature of [Absolute Reality](#) and human existence, and it is sometimes called "non-absolutism" doctrine.<sup>[55]</sup> However, it is not a doctrine about tolerating or condoning activities such as sacrificing or killing animals for food, violence against disbelievers or any other living being as "perhaps right".<sup>[54]</sup> The Five vows for Jain monks and nuns, for example, are strict requirements and there is no "perhaps, just one perspective".<sup>[56]</sup> Similarly, since ancient times, Jainism co-existed with Buddhism and Hinduism, according to Dundas, but Jainism was highly critical of the knowledge systems and ideologies of its rivals, and vice versa.<sup>[57]</sup>

The principle of *anekāntavāda* is one of the foundational [Jain philosophical](#) concept. The development of *anekāntavāda* also encouraged the development of the dialectics of *syādvāda* (conditioned viewpoints) and *nayavāda* (partial viewpoints).

According to Karl Potter, the Jain *anekāntavāda* doctrine emerged in a milieu that included Buddhists and Hindus in ancient and medieval India.<sup>[58]</sup> The diverse Hindu schools such as Nyaya-Vaisheshika, Samkhya-Yoga and Mimamsa-Vedanta, all accepted the premise of [Atman](#) that "unchanging permanent soul, self exists and is self-evident", while various schools of early Buddhism denied it and substituted it with [Anatta](#) (no-self, no-soul). Further, for causation theories, Vedanta schools and Madhyamika Buddhists had similar ideas, while Nyaya-Vaisheshika and non-Madhyamika Buddhists generally agreed on the other side. Jainism, using its *anekāntavāda* doctrine occupied the center of this theological divide on soul-self (*jīva*) and causation theories, between the various schools of Buddhist and Hindu thought.<sup>[44][58]</sup>

## Origins [Edit](#)

The origins of *anekāntavāda* are traceable in the teachings of Mahāvīra, who used it effectively to show the relativity of truth and reality. Taking a relativistic viewpoint, Mahāvīra is said to have explained the nature of the soul as both permanent, from the point of view of underlying substance, and temporary, from the point of view of its modes and modification.<sup>[59]</sup>



## Early history [Edit](#)

Early Jain texts were not composed in Vedic or classical Sanskrit, but in Ardhamagadhi Prakrit language.<sup>[60]</sup> According to Matilal, the earliest Jain literature that present a developing form of a substantial *anekantavada* doctrine is found in Sanskrit texts, and after Jaina scholars had adopted Sanskrit to debate their ideas with Buddhists and Hindus of their era.<sup>[61]</sup> These texts show a synthetic development, the existence and borrowing of terminology, ideas and concepts from rival schools of Indian thought but with innovation and original thought that disagreed with their peers.<sup>[61]</sup>

The early Svetambara canons and teachings do not use the terms *anekāntavāda* and *syādvāda*, but contain teachings in rudimentary form without giving it proper structure or establishing it as a separate doctrine. Śvētāmbara text, *Sutrakritanga* contains references to *Vibhagyavāda*, which, according to [Hermann Jacobi](#), is the same as *syādvāda* and *saptibhaṅgī*.<sup>[62]</sup> For example, Jacobi in his 1895 translation interpreted *vibhagyavada* as *syadvada*, the former mentioned in the Svetambara Jain canonical text *Sutrakritanga*.<sup>[63]</sup> However, the Digambara Jains dispute this text is canonical or even authentic.<sup>[64]</sup>

A monk should be modest, though he be of a fearless mind; he should expound the *syādvāda*, he should use the two permitted kinds of speech, living among virtuous men, impartial and wise.

— *Sūtrakritāṅga*, 14:22, A Svetambara text disputed by the Digambaras<sup>[63]</sup>

According to Upadhyaye, the *Bhagvatisūtra* (also called Vyākhyāprajñapti) mentions three primary predications of the *saptibhaṅgīnaya*.<sup>[65]</sup> This too is a Svetambara text, and considered by Digambara Jains as unauthentic.<sup>[64]</sup>

The earliest comprehensive teachings of *anekāntavāda* doctrine is found in the *Tattvarthasutra* of Umasvati, considered to be authoritative by all Jain sects including Svetambara and Digambara.<sup>[18]</sup> The century in which Umaswati lived is unclear, but variously placed by contemporary scholars to sometime between 2nd and 5th century.<sup>[66][67][68]</sup>

The Digambara scholar [Kundakunda](#), in his mystical Jain texts, expounded on the doctrine of *syādvāda* and *saptibhaṅgī* in *Pravacanasāra* and *Pancastikayasāra*.<sup>[65][18]</sup> Kundakunda also used *nayas* to discuss the essence of the *self* in *Samayasāra*. Kundakunda is believed in the Digambara tradition to have lived about the 1st-century CE, but has been placed by early modern era scholars to 2nd or 3rd century CE.<sup>[69]</sup> In contrast, the earliest available secondary literature on Kundakunda appears in about the 10th century, which has led recent scholarship to suggest that he may have lived in or after 8th-century. This radical reassessment in Kundakunda chronology, if accurate, would place his comprehensive theories on *anekantavada* to the late 1st millennium CE.



## Parable of the blind men and elephant [Edit](#)

### Seven blind men and an elephant parable

The Jain texts explain the *anekāntvāda* concept using the parable of blind men and elephant, in a manner similar to those found in both Buddhist and Hindu texts about limits of perception and the importance of complete context. The parable has several Indian variations, but broadly goes as follows: [\[71\]](#)[\[72\]](#)

A group of blind men heard that a strange animal, called an elephant, had been brought to the town, but none of them were aware of its shape and form. Out of curiosity, they said: "We must inspect and know it by touch, of which we are capable". So, they sought it out, and when they found it they groped about it. In the case of the first person, whose hand landed on the trunk, said "This being is like a thick snake". For another one whose hand reached its ear, it seemed like a kind of fan. As for another person, whose hand was upon its leg, said, the elephant is a pillar like a tree-trunk. The blind man who placed his hand upon its side said, "elephant is a wall". Another who felt its tail, described it as a rope. The last felt its tusk, stating the elephant is that which is hard, smooth and like a spear.

This parable is called *Andha-gaja-nyaya* maxim in Jain texts. [\[73\]](#)

Two of the Jain references to this parable are found in *Tattvarthaslokavatika* of Vidyanandi (9th century) and it appears twice in the *Syādvādamanjari* of Ācārya Mallisena (13th century). [\[73\]](#) According to Mallisena, whenever anyone takes a partial, unconditional view of the ultimate reality, and denies the possibility of another aspect of that reality, it is an instance of the above parable and a defective view. [\[73\]](#) Mallisena goes further in his second reference to the above parable and states that all reality has infinite aspects and attributes, all assertions can only be relatively true. This does not mean scepticism or doubt is the right path to knowledge, according to Mallisena and other Jain scholars, but that any philosophical assertion is only conditionally, partially true. Any and all viewpoints, states Mallisena, that do not admit an exception are false views. [\[73\]](#)

While the [same parable](#) is found in Buddhist and Hindu texts to emphasize the need to be watchful for partial viewpoints of a complex reality, the Jain text apply it to isolated topic and all subjects. [\[74\]](#)[\[75\]](#)[\[76\]](#) For example, the *syadvada* principle states that all the following seven predicates must be accepted as true for a cooking pot, according to Matilal: [\[77\]](#)

- from a certain point of view, or in a certain sense, the pot exists

- from a certain point of view, the pot does not exist
- from a certain point of view, the pot exists and does not exist
- from a certain point of view, the pot is inexpressible
- from a certain point of view, the pot both exists and is inexpressible
- from a certain point of view, the pot both does not exist and is inexpressible
- from a certain point of view, the pot exists, does not exist, and is also inexpressible

## Medieval developments [Edit](#)

Ācārya [Haribhadra](#) (8th century CE) was one of the leading proponents of *anekāntavāda*. He was the first classical author to write a [doxography](#), a compendium of a variety of intellectual views. This attempted to contextualise Jain thoughts within the broad framework, rather than espouse narrow partisan views. It interacted with the many possible intellectual orientations available to Indian thinkers around the 8th century.<sup>[78]</sup>

Ācārya Amrtacandra starts his famous 10th century CE work *Purusathasiddhiupaya* with strong praise for *anekāntavāda*: "I bow down to the principle of *anekānta*, the source and foundation of the highest scriptures, the dispeller of wrong one-sided notions, that which takes into account all aspects of truth, reconciling diverse and even contradictory traits of all objects or entity."<sup>[79]</sup>

Ācārya Vidyānandī (11th century CE) provides the analogy of the ocean to explain the nature of truth in *Tattvarthaslokavārtikā*, 116:<sup>[80]</sup>

[Yaśovijaya Gaṇī](#), a 17th-century Jain monk, went beyond *anekāntavāda* by advocating *madhāyastha*, meaning "standing in the middle" or "equidistance". This position allowed him to praise qualities in others even though the people were non-Jain and belonged to other faiths.<sup>[81]</sup> There was a period of stagnation after Yasovijayaji, as there were no new contributions to the development of Jain philosophy.<sup>[82]</sup>

The [Jain philosophical](#) concept of Anekantavada made important contributions to ancient [Indian philosophy](#), in the areas of skepticism and relativity.<sup>[83]</sup> The epistemology of *anekāntavāda* and *syādvāda* also had a profound impact on the development of ancient Indian logic and philosophy.

While employing *anekāntavāda*, the 17th century Jain scholar [Yasovijaya](#) stated that it is not *anābhigrahika* (indiscriminate attachment to all views as being true), which is effectively a kind of misconceived relativism.<sup>[84]</sup> In Jain belief, *anekāntavāda* transcends the various traditions of Buddhism and Hinduism.<sup>[85]</sup>

## Role in Jain history [Edit](#)

*Anekāntavāda* played a role in the history of Jainism in India, during intellectual debates from [Śaivas](#), [Vaiṣṇavas](#), [Buddhists](#), [Muslims](#), and [Christians](#) at various times. According to John Koller, professor of [Asian studies](#), *anekāntavāda* allowed Jain thinkers to maintain the validity of their doctrine, while at the same time respectfully criticizing the views of their opponents.<sup>[86]</sup> In other cases, it was a tool used by Jaina scholars to confront and dispute Buddhist scholars in ancient India, or in the case of [Haribhadra](#) justify the retaliation of the killing of his two nephews by Buddhist monks, with capital punishment for all Buddhist monks in the suspected monastery, according to the Buddhist version of Haribhadra's biography.<sup>[87]</sup>

There is historical evidence that along with intolerance of non-Jains, Jains in their history have also been tolerant and generous just like Buddhists and Hindus.<sup>[88]</sup> Their texts have never presented a theory for holy war.<sup>[88]</sup> Jains and their temples have historically procured and preserved the classic manuscripts of Buddhism and Hinduism, a strong indicator of acceptance and plurality.<sup>[88]</sup> The combination of historic facts, states Cort, suggest that Jain history is a combination of tolerance and intolerance of non-Jain views, and that it is inappropriate to rewrite the Jainism past as a history of "benevolence and tolerance" towards others.<sup>[89]</sup>

- [Gandhi](#) explained his inconsistencies to be Anekantavada.<sup>[90]</sup>

## **Influence on Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi**[Edit](#)

Mahatma Gandhi was influenced by the principle of Anekantavada.<sup>[91]</sup> He attributed his seemingly contradictory positions over a period of time to the learning process, experiments with truth and his belief in *anekāntavāda*, in the journal "[Young India](#) – 21 Jan 1926":<sup>[92][90]</sup>

I am an [Advaitist](#) and yet I can support [Dvaitism](#) (dualism). The world is changing every moment, and is therefore unreal, it has no permanent existence. But though it is constantly changing, it has a something about it which persists and it is therefore to that extent real. I have therefore no objection to calling it real and unreal, and thus being called an *Anekāntavadi* or a *Syādvadi*. But my *Syādvāda* is not the *Syādvāda* of the learned, it is peculiarly my own. I cannot engage in a debate with them. It has been my experience that I am always true from my point of view, and am often wrong from the point of view of my honest critics. I know that we are both right from our respective points of view. And this knowledge saves me from attributing motives to my opponents or critics. (...) My *Anekāntavāda* is the result of the twin doctrine of [Satyagraha](#) and [ahimsā](#).

## **Against religious intolerance and contemporary terrorism**[Edit](#)

Referring to the [September 11 attacks](#), John Koller states that the threat to life from

religious violence in modern society mainly exists due to faulty epistemology and metaphysics as well as faulty ethics. A failure to respect the life of other human beings and other life forms, states Koller, is "rooted in dogmatic but mistaken knowledge claims that fail to recognize other legitimate perspectives". Koller states that *anekāntavāda* is a Jain doctrine that each side commit to accepting truths of multiple perspectives, dialogue and negotiations. [\[93\]](#)[\[94\]](#)[\[95\]](#)

According to Sabine Scholz, the application of the *Anekantavada* as a religious basis for "intellectual Ahimsa" is a modern era reinterpretation, one attributed to the writings of A.B. Dhruva in 1933. This view states that *Anekantavada* is an expression of "religious tolerance of other opinions and harmony". In the 21st century, some writers have presented it as an intellectual weapon against "intolerance, fundamentalism and terrorism". [\[96\]](#) However, other scholars such as [John E. Cort](#) and [Paul Dundas](#) state that, while Jainism indeed teaches non-violence as the highest ethical value, the reinterpretation of *Anekantavada* as "religious tolerance of other opinions" is a "misreading of the original doctrine", according to Sabine Scholz. In Jain history, it was a metaphysical doctrine and a philosophical method to formulate its distinct ascetic practice of liberation. Jain history shows, to the contrary, that it persistently was harshly critical and intolerant of Buddhist and Hindu spiritual theories, beliefs and ideologies. [\[97\]](#)[\[96\]](#) John Cort states that the *Anekantavada* doctrine in pre-20th century Jain literature had no relation to religious tolerance or "intellectual Ahimsa". Jain intellectual and social history toward non-Jains, according to Cort, has been contrary to the modern revisionist attempts, particularly by diaspora Jains, to present "Jains having exhibited a spirit of understanding and tolerance toward non-Jains", or that Jains were rare or unique in practicing religious tolerance in Indian intellectual history. [\[98\]](#) According to Padmanabha Jaini, states Cort, indiscriminate open mindedness and the approach of "accepting all religious paths as equally correct when in fact they are not" is an erroneous view in Jainism and not supported by the *Anekantavada* doctrine. [\[99\]](#)

According to Paul Dundas, in and after the 12th century, the persecution and violence against Jains by Muslim state caused Jain scholars to revisit their theory of [Ahimsa](#) (non-violence). For example, Jinadatta Suri in 12th century, wrote during a time of widespread destruction of Jain temples and blocking of Jain pilgrimage by Muslim armies, that "anybody engaged in a religious activity who was forced to fight and kill somebody" in self-defense would not lose any merit. [\[100\]](#) N.L. Jain, quoting Acarya Mahaprajna, states *Anekantavada* doctrine is not a principle that can be applied to all situations or fields. In his view, the doctrine has its limits and *Anekantavada* doctrine does not mean intellectual tolerance or acceptance of religious violence, terrorism, taking of hostages, proxy wars such as in Kashmir, and that "to initiate a conflict is as sinful as to tolerate or not oppose it". [\[101\]](#)

The reinterpretation of *Anekantavada* as a doctrine of religious tolerance is novel,

popular but not unusual for contemporary Jains. It is a pattern of reinterpretation and reinvention to rebrand and reposition that is found in many religions, states Scholz.<sup>[96]</sup>

According to Bhagchandra Jain, one of the difference between the Buddhist and Jain views is that "Jainism accepts all statements to possess some relative (*anekāntika*) truth" while for Buddhism this is not the case.<sup>[102]</sup>

In Jainism, states Jayatilleke, "no proposition could in theory be asserted to be categorically true or false, irrespective of the standpoint from which it was made, in Buddhism such categorical assertions were considered possible in the case of some propositions."<sup>[103]</sup> Unlike Jainism, there are propositions that are categorically true in Buddhism, and there are others that are *anekamsika* (uncertain, indefinite). Examples of categorically true and certain doctrines are the [Four Noble Truths](#), while examples of the latter in Buddhism are the [avyakata-theses](#).<sup>[103]</sup> Further, unlike Jainism, Buddhism does not have a Nayavāda doctrine.<sup>[104]</sup>

According to Karl Potter and other scholars, Hinduism developed various theory of relations such as *satkaryavada*, *asatkaryavada*, *avirodhavada* and others.<sup>[58][105]</sup> The *anekantavada* overlaps with two major theories found in Hindu and Buddhist thought, according to James Lochtefeld. The *Anekantavada* doctrine is *satkaryavada* in explaining causes, and the *asatkaryavada* in explaining qualities or attributes in the effects.<sup>[58][106]</sup> The different schools of [Hindu philosophy](#) further elaborated and refined the theory of [pramanas](#) and the theory of relations to establish correct means to structure propositions in their view.<sup>[107]</sup>

[Indologists](#) such as professor [John E. Cort](#) state that *anekāntavāda* is a doctrine that was historical used by Jain scholars not to accept other viewpoints, but to insist on the Jain viewpoint. Jain monks used *anekāntavāda* and *syādvāda* as debating weapons to silence their critics and defend the Jain doctrine.<sup>[97]</sup> According to [Paul Dundas](#), in Jain hands, this method of analysis became "a fearsome weapon of philosophical [polemic](#) with which the doctrines of [Hinduism](#) and [Buddhism](#) could be pared down to their ideological bases of simple permanence and impermanence, respectively, and thus could be shown to be one-pointed and inadequate as the overall interpretations of reality they purported to be".<sup>[108]</sup> The Jain scholars, however, considered their own theory of *Anekantavada* self-evident, immune from criticism, needing neither limitations nor conditions.<sup>[108]</sup>

The doctrines of *anekāntavāda* and *syādvāda* are often criticised to denying any certainty, or accepting incoherent contradictory doctrines. Another argument against it, posited by medieval era Buddhists and Hindus applied the principle on itself, that is if nothing is definitely true or false, is *anekāntavāda* true or false?<sup>[109][110]</sup>

According to Karl Potter, the *Anekantavada* doctrine accepts the norm in Indian



philosophies that all knowledge is contextual, that object and subject are interdependent. However, as a theory of relations, it does not solve the deficiencies in other progress philosophies, just "compounds the felony by merely duplicating the already troublesome notion of a dependence relation".<sup>[111]</sup>

## Nyaya Hindu philosophy [Edit](#)

The [Nyaya](#) school criticized the Jain doctrine of *anekantavada*, states Karl Potter, as "wanting to say one thing at one time, the other at another", thereby ignoring the principle of non-contradiction.<sup>[111]</sup> The Naiyayikas states that it makes no sense to simultaneously say, "jiva and ajiva are not related" and "jiva and ajiva are related". Jains state that *jiva* attaches itself to karmic particles (ajiva) which means there is a relation between ajiva and jiva. The Jain theory of ascetic salvation teaches cleansing of karmic particles and destroying the bound ajiva to the jiva, yet, Jain scholars also deny that ajiva and jiva are related or at least interdependent, according to the Nyaya scholars. The Jain theory of *anekantavada* makes its theory of karma, asceticism and salvation incoherent, according to Nyaya Hindu texts.<sup>[111]</sup>

## Vaisheshika Hindu philosophy [Edit](#)

The [Vaisheshika](#) and [Shaivism](#) school scholar Vyomashiva criticized the *Anekantavada* doctrine because, according to him, it makes all moral life and spiritual pursuits for [moksha](#) meaningless. Any spiritually liberated person must be considered under *Anekantavada* doctrine to be [a] both liberated and not liberated from one point of view, and [b] simply not liberated from another point of view, since all assertions are to be qualified and conditional under it. In other words, states Vyomashiva, this doctrine leads to a paradox and circularity.<sup>[112]</sup>

## Vedanta Hindu philosophy [Edit](#)

*Anekāntavāda* was analyzed and critiqued by [Adi Sankarācārya](#) (~800 CE) in his *bhasya* on [Brahmasutra](#) (2:2:33–36):<sup>[113]</sup> He stated that *anekantavada* doctrine when applied to philosophy suffers from two problems: *virodha* (contradictions) and *samsaya* (dubity), neither of which it is able to reconcile with objectivity.<sup>[112]</sup>

It is impossible that contradictory attributes such as being and non-being should at the same time belong to one and the same thing; just as observation teaches us that a thing cannot be hot and cold at the same moment. The third alternative expressed in the words — they either are such or not such — results in cognition of indefinite nature, which is no more a source of true knowledge than doubt is. Thus the means of knowledge, the object of knowledge, the knowing subject, and the act of knowledge become all alike indefinite. How can his followers act on a doctrine, the matter of which is altogether indeterminate? The result of your efforts is perfect knowledge and is not perfect knowledge. Observation shows that, only

when a course of action is known to have a definite result, people set about it without hesitation. Hence a man who proclaims a doctrine of altogether indefinite contents does not deserve to be listened any more than a drunken or a mad man.

— *Adi Sankara, Brahmasutra, 2.2:33–36*

Sankara's criticism of *anekantavada* extended beyond the arguments of it being incoherent epistemology in ontological matters. According to Shankara, the goal of philosophy is to identify one's doubts and remove them through reason and understanding, not get more confused.<sup>[111]</sup> The problem with *anekantavada* doctrine is that it compounds and glorifies confusion. Further, states Shankara, Jains use this doctrine to be "certain that everything is uncertain". According to Karl Potter, Shankara does not take Jains seriously and admits that he doesn't understand Jainism's theory of relations.<sup>[111]</sup>

Contemporary scholars, states Piotr Balcerowicz, concur that the Jain doctrine of *Anekantavada* does reject some versions of the "law of non-contradiction", but it is incorrect to state that it rejects this law in all instances.<sup>[114]</sup>

## Buddhist philosophy [Edit](#)

The Buddhist scholar Santaraksita, and his student Kamalasila, criticized *anekantavada* by presenting his arguments that it leads to the Buddhist premise "jivas (souls) do not exist". That is, the two of the most important doctrines of Jainism are mutually contradictory premises.<sup>[111][115]</sup> According to Santaraksita, Jains state that "jiva is one considered collectively, and many considered distributively", but if so debates Santaraksita, "jiva cannot change". He then proceeds to show that changing jiva necessarily means jiva appear and disappear every moment, which is equivalent to "jiva don't exist".<sup>[111]</sup> According to Karl Potter, the argument posited by Santaraksita is flawed, because it commits what is called in the Western logic as the "fallacy of division".<sup>[111]</sup>

The Buddhist logician [Dharmakirti](#) critiqued *anekāntavāda* as follows:<sup>[116]</sup>

With the differentiation removed, all things have dual nature. Then, if somebody is implored to eat curd, then why he does not eat camel?" The insinuation is obvious; if curd exists from the nature of curd and does not exist from the nature of a camel, then one is justified in eating camel, as by eating camel, he is merely eating the negation of curd.

— *Dharmakirti, Pramānavarttikakārika*

## Self-criticism in Jain scholarship [Edit](#)

The medieval era Jain logicians [Akalanka](#) and [Vidyananda](#), who were likely

contemporaries of Aḍi Shankara, acknowledged many issues with *anekantavada* in their texts. For example, Akalanka in his *Pramanasamgraha* acknowledges seven problems when *anekantavada* is applied to develop a comprehensive and consistent philosophy: dubiety, contradiction, lack of conformity of bases (*vaiyadhi karanya*), joint fault, infinite regress, intermixture and absence.<sup>[112]</sup> Vidyananda acknowledged six of those in the Akalanka list, adding the problem of *vyatikara* (cross breeding in ideas) and *apratipatti* (incomprehensibility). [Prabhācandra](#), who probably lived in the 11th-century, and several other later Jain scholars accepted many of these identified issues in *anekantavada* application.<sup>[112]</sup>

- [Problem of universals](#)
- [Contextualism](#)
- [Degrees of truth](#)
- [False dilemma](#)
- [Indian logic](#)
- [Jain epistemology](#)
- [Jaina seven-valued logic](#)
- [Logical disjunction](#)
- [Logical equality](#)
- [Logical value](#)
- [Multiplicities](#)
- [Multi-valued logic](#)
- [Perspectivism](#)
- [Principle of bivalence](#)
- [Propositional logic](#)
- [Relativism](#)
- [Rhizome \(philosophy\)](#)
- [Value pluralism](#)

1. <sup>^</sup> [Cort 2000](#), p. 325-326, 342.
2. <sup>^</sup> [Dundas, Paul \(2004\)](#). "*Beyond Anekāntavāda : A Jain approach to religious tolerance*". In (ed.) Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ. pp. 123–136. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#). CS1 maint: Extra text: editors list ([link](#))
3. <sup>^</sup> [Cort 2000](#), p. 324.
4. <sup>^</sup> [Wiley 2009](#), p. 36.
5. <sup>^</sup> [Koller, John \(2004\)](#). "*Why is Anekāntavāda important?*". In (ed.) Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 85–88. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#). CS1 maint: Extra text: editors list ([link](#))
6. <sup>^</sup> [Jaini, Padmanabh \(1998\)](#). *The Jaina Path of Purification*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. p. 91. [ISBN 81-208-1578-5](#).
7. <sup>^</sup> [Matilal 1981](#), pp. 2-3.

8. [^ Matilal 1981](#), pp. 1-2.
9. [^ Gandhi, Mahatma \(1955\)](#)
10. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) \[c\]\(#\) \[d\]\(#\) Charitrapragya 2004](#), pp. 75–79.
11. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) Dundas 2002](#), pp. 229–231.
12. [^ Grimes, John \(1996\)](#) p. 34
13. [^ Monier Monier-Williams \(1899\)](#), "वाद", Sanskrit English Dictionary with Etymology, Oxford University Press, pages 939-940
14. [^ Philip C. Almond \(1982\)](#). [Mystical Experience and Religious Doctrine: An Investigation of the Study of Mysticism in World Religions](#). Walter de Gruyter. p. 75. [ISBN 978-90-279-3160-3](#).
15. [^ Nicholas F. Gier \(2000\)](#). [Spiritual Titanism: Indian, Chinese, and Western Perspectives](#). State University of New York Press. pp. 80, 90–92. [ISBN 978-0-7914-4528-0](#).
16. [^ Andrew R. Murphy \(2011\)](#). [The Blackwell Companion to Religion and Violence](#). John Wiley & Sons. pp. 267–269. [ISBN 978-1-4051-9131-9](#).
17. [^ Matilal 1981](#), p. 1.
18. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) \[c\]\(#\) \[d\]\(#\) Dundas 2002](#), pp. 229–231.
19. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) Jain philosophy](#), IEP, Mark Owen Webb, Texas Tech University
20. [^ Matilal 1990](#), pp. 301–305.
21. [^ Balcerowicz 2015](#), pp. 205–218.
22. [^ Matilal 1998](#), pp. 128–135.
23. [^ Koller 2000](#), pp. 400–407.
24. [^ Sangave 2006](#), p. 48-51.
25. [^ Matilal 1981](#), p. 2.
26. [^ Matilal 1981](#), pp. 2-3, 30-32, 52-54.
27. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) \[c\]\(#\) Matilal 1981](#), pp. 52-53.
28. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) Charitrapragya 2004](#), pp. 81–83.
29. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) \[c\]\(#\) \[d\]\(#\) Koller, John \(2004\)](#). "Why is Anekāntavāda important?". In (ed.) Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 93–95. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#). CS1 maint: Extra text: editors list ([link](#))
30. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) Koller, John \(2004\)](#). "Why is Anekāntavāda important?". In (ed.) Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 90–92. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#). CS1 maint: Extra text: editors list ([link](#))
31. [^ Dundas 2002](#), p. 230.
32. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) Grimes, John \(1996\)](#) p. 312
33. [^ Vijay K Jain 2016](#), p. 29.
34. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) Vijay K Jain 2016](#), p. 30.
35. [^ Vijay K Jain 2016](#), p. 163.
36. [^ Vijay K Jain 2016](#), p. 174.
37. [^ Grimes, John \(1996\)](#) p. 198, 202–03, 274, 301
38. [^ \[a\]\(#\) \[b\]\(#\) \[c\]\(#\) Long 2009](#), p. 125.

39. ^ [a b Dundas 2002](#), pp. 230–231.
40. ^ Grimes, John (1996) p. 119, 198–03, 274, 301
41. ^ [Vijay K Jain 2016](#), p. 28.
42. ^ Walter Benesch (1997). [An Introduction to Comparative Philosophy](#). Springer. pp. 133–134. [ISBN 978-0-230-59738-9](#).
43. ^ Karl H. Potter (1991). [Presuppositions of India's Philosophies](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 145–149. [ISBN 978-81-208-0779-2](#).
44. ^ [a b](#) For a complete discussion of *anekantavada* on the Jain concept of *jiva*: W. J. Johnson (1995). [Harmless Souls: Karmic Bondage and Religious Change in Early Jainism with Special Reference to Umāsvāti and Kundakunda](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 232–253. [ISBN 978-81-208-1309-0](#).
45. ^ [Dundas 2002](#), pp. 87–88.
46. ^ [Wiley 2004](#), pp. 2–5.
47. ^ [Long 2013](#), pp. 122–125.
48. ^ [Jaini 1998](#), pp. 103–106.
49. ^ [Cort 2000](#), pp. 329–330.
50. ^ [Hiriyanna 1993](#), pp. 157–158, 168–169.
51. ^ [a b](#) Paul Dundas (2004). Tara Sethia, ed. [Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism](#). Motilal Banarsidass. p. 123–125. [ISBN 978-81-208-2036-4](#).
52. ^ Paul Dundas (2004). Tara Sethia, ed. [Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism](#). Motilal Banarsidass. p. 125–127. [ISBN 978-81-208-2036-4](#).
53. ^ John Koller (2004). Tara Sethia, ed. [Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 88–89. [ISBN 978-81-208-2036-4](#).
54. ^ [a b](#) [Dundas 2002](#), pp. 232–234.
55. ^ [Sethia 2004](#), pp. 86–91.
56. ^ [Long 2009](#), pp. 98–106.
57. ^ [Dundas 2002](#), p. 233.
58. ^ [a b c d](#) Karl H. Potter (1991). [Presuppositions of India's Philosophies](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 114–115. [ISBN 978-81-208-0779-2](#).
59. ^ Charitrapragya, Samani (2004) p. 75
60. ^ [Dundas 2002](#), pp. 60–62.
61. ^ [a b](#) [Matilal 1981](#), pp. 1–3.
62. ^ Jacobi, Hermann (1895) 14:21–22
63. ^ [a b](#) H Jacobi (1895). [Gaina Sûtras](#). Clarendon Press. pp. 327 with footnotes.
64. ^ [a b](#) [Jaina canon](#), Encyclopaedia Britannica
65. ^ [a b](#) Upadhyaye, A. N. (2001) pp. 6136–37
66. ^ Walter Slaje (2008). [Śāstrārambha: Inquiries Into the Preamble in Sanskrit](#). Otto Harrassowitz Verlag. p. 35 with footnote 23. [ISBN 978-3-447-05645-8](#).
67. ^ [Jaini 1998](#), p. 81.
68. ^ [Dundas 2006](#), pp. 395–396
69. ^ Piotr Balcerowicz (2003). [Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion](#). Motilal



Banarsidass. pp. 280–282. [ISBN 978-81-208-1977-1](#).

70. <sup>^</sup> [Dundas 2002](#), pp. 107–109.
71. <sup>^</sup> E. Bruce Goldstein (2010). [Encyclopedia of Perception](#). SAGE Publications. p. 492. [ISBN 978-1-4129-4081-8](#).
72. <sup>^</sup> C.R. Snyder; Carol E. Ford (2013). [Coping with Negative Life Events: Clinical and Social Psychological Perspectives](#). Springer Science. p. 12. [ISBN 978-1-4757-9865-4](#).
73. <sup>^</sup> <sup>a</sup> <sup>b</sup> <sup>c</sup> <sup>d</sup> Piotr Balcerowicz (2003). [Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 40–43 with footnotes. [ISBN 978-81-208-1977-1](#).
74. <sup>^</sup> John D. Ireland (2007). [Udana and the Itivuttaka: Two Classics from the Pali Canon](#). Buddhist Publication Society. pp. 9, 81–84. [ISBN 978-955-24-0164-0](#).
75. <sup>^</sup> Paul J. Griffiths (2007). [An Apology for Apologetics: A Study in the Logic of Interreligious Dialogue](#). Wipf and Stock. pp. 46–47. [ISBN 978-1-55635-731-2](#).
76. <sup>^</sup> E. Bruce Goldstein (2010). [Encyclopedia of Perception](#). SAGE Publications. p. 492. [ISBN 978-1-4129-4081-8](#).
77. <sup>^</sup> [Matilal 1981](#), pp. 54–56.
78. <sup>^</sup> Dundas, Paul (2002) p. 228
79. <sup>^</sup> Jain, J. P. (2006) Verse no. 2
80. <sup>^</sup> T. W. Rhys Davids (1980) pp. 576
81. <sup>^</sup> Dundas, Paul (2004) p. 134
82. <sup>^</sup> Jain, J. C. (2001) p. 1487
83. <sup>^</sup> McEvilley, Thomas (2002) p. 335
84. <sup>^</sup> Dundas, Paul (2004) pp. 131–132
85. <sup>^</sup> Wright, J. C. (2000). "Reviewed work(s): Jaina Theory of Multiple Facets of Reality and Truth (Anekāntavāda) by Nagin J. Shah". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. London: Cambridge University Press. **63** (3): 435–37. [doi:10.1017/s0041977x00008594](#). [JSTOR 1559507](#).
86. <sup>^</sup> John Koller (2004). Tara Sethia, ed. [Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism](#). Motilal Banarsidass. p. 8. [ISBN 978-81-208-2036-4](#).
87. <sup>^</sup> [Cort 2000](#), pp. 335–336, 338–339.
88. <sup>^</sup> <sup>a</sup> <sup>b</sup> <sup>c</sup> [Cort 2000](#), pp. 336–337.
89. <sup>^</sup> [Cort 2000](#), pp. 340–341.
90. <sup>^</sup> <sup>a</sup> <sup>b</sup> [Long 2013](#), p. 169.
91. <sup>^</sup> Hay, Stephen N. (1970). "Jain Influences on Gandhi's Early Thought". In (ed.) Sibnarayan Ray. *Gandhi India and the World*. Bombay: Nachiketa Publishers. pp. 14–23. CS1 maint: Extra text: editors list ([link](#))
92. <sup>^</sup> Gandhi, Mahatma (1955)
93. <sup>^</sup> Koller, John (2004) pp. 85–98
94. <sup>^</sup> Stroud, Scott R. (2014-07-03). ["Anekāntavāda and Engaged Rhetorical Pluralism: Explicating Jaina Views on Perspectivism, Violence, and Rhetoric"](#). *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*. **17** (2): 131–156.



95. <sup>^</sup> [James William Jones 2008](#).
  96. <sup>^</sup> [a b c](#) Sabine Scholz (2012). Julia A. B. Hegewald and Subrata K. Mitra, ed. [Re-Use-The Art and Politics of Integration and Anxiety](#). SAGE Publications. pp. 282–284. [ISBN 978-81-321-0981-5](#).
  97. <sup>^</sup> [a b](#) Cort 2000, pp. 324–347.
  98. <sup>^</sup> [Cort 2000](#), pp. 329–331.
  99. <sup>^</sup> [Cort 2000](#), pp. 333–334.
  100. <sup>^</sup> [Dundas 2002](#), pp. 162–163.
  101. <sup>^</sup> N.L. Jain (2008). Colette Caillat and Nalini Balbir, ed. [Jaina Studies](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 82–84. [ISBN 978-81-208-3247-3](#).
  102. <sup>^</sup> Bhagchandra Jain; *The Rudiments Of Anekāntavāda In Early Pali Literature*
  103. <sup>^</sup> [a b](#) Jayatilleke; Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge. Publisher: George Allen and Unwin, 1963, pp. 279–280.
  104. <sup>^</sup> Jayatilleke; Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge. Publisher: George Allen and Unwin, 1963, p. 280
  105. <sup>^</sup> Richard King. [Early Advaita Vedanta and Buddhism: The Mahayana Context of the Gaudapadiya-Karika](#). State University of New York Press. pp. 194–203. [ISBN 978-1-4384-0904-7](#).
  106. <sup>^</sup> James G. Lochtefeld (2002). [The Illustrated Encyclopedia of Hinduism: A-M](#). The Rosen Publishing Group. p. 133, see Causal Models. [ISBN 978-0-8239-3179-8](#).
  107. <sup>^</sup> Julius Lipner (1986). [The Face of Truth: A Study of Meaning and Metaphysics in the Vedantic Theology of Ramanuja](#). State University of New York Press. pp. 82–89, 133–136. [ISBN 978-0-88706-038-0](#).
  108. <sup>^</sup> [a b](#) Dundas, Paul (2002) p. 231
  109. <sup>^</sup> Webb, Mark Owen. ["The Jain Philosophy"](#). The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. [Archived](#) from the original on 2 March 2008. Retrieved 2008-03-18.
  110. <sup>^</sup> Pandya, V. (2001) p. 5210
  111. <sup>^</sup> [a b c d e f g h](#) Karl H. Potter (1991). [Presuppositions of India's Philosophies](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 145–149. [ISBN 978-81-208-0779-2](#).
  112. <sup>^</sup> [a b c d](#) [Matilal 1981](#), pp. 57–58.
  113. <sup>^</sup> Nakamura, Hajime (1992) pp. 169–70
  114. <sup>^</sup> Piotr Balcerowicz (2003). [Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion](#). Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 42–43 with footnotes 15 and 16. [ISBN 978-81-208-1977-1](#). ,  
**Quote:** "This is the sense in which it is correct to say that the Jainas reject the "law of non-contradiction".
  115. <sup>^</sup> [Matilal 1981](#), p. 57.
  116. <sup>^</sup> [Pandya 2001](#).
- [Balcerowicz, Piotr](#) (2015), [Early Asceticism in India: Ājīvikism and Jainism](#), Routledge, [ISBN 978-1-317-53853-0](#)

- Charitrapragya, Samani (2004), Sethia, Tara, ed., [Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism](#), Motilal Banarsidass, [ISBN 978-81-208-2036-4](#)
- [Dundas, Paul](#) (2002) [1992], [The Jains](#) (Second ed.), [London](#) and [New York](#): Routledge, [ISBN 0-415-26605-X](#)
- [Dundas, Paul](#) (2006), Olivelle, Patrick, ed., [Between the Empires : Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE](#), Oxford University Press, [ISBN 978-0-19-977507-1](#)
- Acarya Siddhasena Divakara (2004). Bhadrakar Vijaya Gani, ed. Vardhamana Dvatrimika. Jaipur: Prakrit Bharti Academy.
- Dhruva, A. B., ed. (1933). Syadvadamanjari of Mallisena with the Anya-yoga-vyavachheda-dvatrimika of Hemacandra. Bombay: Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. 83.
- Burch, George Bosworth (1964). ["Seven-Valued Logic in Jain Philosophy"](#). International Philosophical Quarterly. Bronx, NY. **IV** (1): 68–93. [doi:10.5840/ipq19644140](#). [ISSN 0019-0365](#). Archived from [the original](#) on 10 December 2011.
- Chatterjea, Tara (2001). Knowledge and Freedom in [Indian Philosophy](#). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. [ISBN 0-7391-0692-9](#).
- [Cort, John](#) (2000). "Intellectual Ahimsa revisited: Jain Tolerance and Intolerance of Others". Philosophy East and West. University of Hawai'i Press. **50** (3): 324–47. [JSTOR 1400177](#).
- Dasgupta, S. N. (1932). History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duli Chandra Jain, ed. (1997). Studies in Jainism: Reader 2. New York: Jain Study Circle Inc. [ISBN 0-9626105-2-6](#).
- Dundas, Paul (2002). John Hinnels, ed. The Jains. London: Routledge. [ISBN 0-415-26606-8](#).
- Nagendra Kr. Singh, ed. (2001). Encyclopedia of Jainism (Edited by Nagendra Kr. Singh). New Delhi: Anmol Publications. [ISBN 81-261-0691-3](#).
  - Jain, J. C. (2001). "Development of doctrine of Anekāntavāda". In Nagendra Kr. Singh. Encyclopedia of Jainism. New Delhi: Anmol Publications. [ISBN 81-261-0691-3](#).
  - Pandya, V. (2001), "Refutation of Jaina Darsana by Sankaracarya", in Nagendra Kr. Singh, Encyclopedia of Jainism, New Delhi: Anmol Publications, [ISBN 81-261-0691-3](#)
  - Upadhyaye, A. N. (2001). ["Syādvāda in the Ardhamagadhi Canon"](#). In Nagendra Kr. Singh. Encyclopedia of Jainism. New Delhi: Anmol Publications. [ISBN 81-261-0691-3](#).
- [Gandhi, Mohandas](#) (1955). Jitendra Thakorbbhai Desai, (comp.) R.K. Prabhu, ed. Truth Is God: Gleanings from the Writings of Mahatma Gandhi Bearing on God, God-Realization and the Godly Way. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
- Grimes, John (1996). A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy: Sanskrit Terms

Defined in English. New York: SUNY Press. [ISBN 0-7914-3068-5](#).

- Humphreys, Christmas (1969). *The Buddhist Way of Life*. London: Unwin Books.
- Hiriyan, M. (1993), [Outlines of Indian Philosophy](#), Motilal Banarsidass, [ISBN 978-81-208-1086-0](#)
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. (1998) [1979], [The Jaina Path of Purification](#), Delhi: [Motilal Banarsidass](#), [ISBN 81-208-1578-5](#)
- Jones, James William (2008), [Blood That Cries Out From the Earth : The Psychology of Religious Terrorism: The Psychology of Religious Terrorism](#), Oxford University Press, [ISBN 978-0-19-804431-4](#)
- Jacobi, Hermann (1884). (ed.) [F. Max Müller](#), ed. [The Ācāranga Sūtra. Sacred Books of the East vol.22, Part 1](#). Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [ISBN 0-7007-1538-X](#). CS1 maint: Extra text: editors list ([link](#)) Note: ISBN refers to the UK:Routledge (2001) reprint. URL is the scan version of the original 1884 reprint.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1895). [F. Max Müller](#), ed. [The Sūtrakritanga](#). Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [ISBN 0-7007-1538-X](#). Note:ISBN refers to the UK:Routledge (2001) reprint. URL is the scan version of the original 1895 reprint.
- Jain, Vijay K (1 January 2016), [Ācārya Samantabhadra's Aptamimamsa \(Devāgamastotra\)](#), [ISBN 9788190363983](#)
- Jain, J. P. (2006). *The Art and Science of Self Realisation: Purusathasiddhiupaya of Ācārya Amrtacandra (in Sanskrit and English)*. Delhi: Radiant Publishers.
- Koller, John M. (2000). "Syādvadā as the Epistemological Key to the Jaina Middle Way Metaphysics of Anekāntavāda". *Philosophy East and West*. Honolulu. **50** (3). [doi:10.1353/pew.2000.0009](#). [ISSN 0031-8221](#). [JSTOR 1400182](#).
- Long, Jeffery D. (2009), [Jainism: An Introduction](#), I. B. Tauris, [ISBN 978-0-8577-3656-7](#)
- Long, Jeffery D. (2013), *Jainism: An Introduction*, I. B. Tauris, [ISBN 978-0-8577-1392-6](#)
- Matilal, Bimal Krishna (1990), [Logic, Language and Reality: Indian Philosophy and Contemporary Issues](#), Motilal Banarsidass, [ISBN 978-81-208-0717-4](#)
- Matilal, Bimal Krishna (1998), Ganeri, Jonardon; Tiwari, Heeraman, eds., [The Character of Logic in India](#), State University of New York Press, [ISBN 978-0-7914-3739-1](#)
- Majmudar, Uma (2005). *Gandhi's Pilgrimage of Faith: From Darkness to Light*. New York: SUNY Press. [ISBN 0-7914-6405-9](#).
- Matilal, B.K. (1981), [The Central Philosophy of Jainism \(Anekāntavāda\)](#) (PDF), L.D. Series 79, Ahmedabad
- McEvilley, Thomas (2002). *The Shape of Ancient Thought: Comparative Studies in Greek and Indian Philosophies*. New York: Allworth Communications, Inc. [ISBN 1-58115-203-5](#).
- Nakamura, Hajim (1992). *Comparative History of Ideas*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Pub. [ISBN 81-208-1004-X](#).

- Sethia, Tara (2004), [\*Ahimsā, Anekānta and Jainism\*](#), Motilal Banarsidass, [ISBN 978-81-208-2036-4](#)
  - Charitrapragya, Samani (2004). "Mahāvira, Anekāntavāda and the World Today". In Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 75–89. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#).
  - Jain, Kamla (2004). "Anekāntavāda in present day social life". In Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ. pp. 113–122. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#).
  - Vallely, Anne (2004). "Anekānta, Ahimsā and question of Pluralism". In Tara Sethia. *Ahimsā, Anekānta, and Jainism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. pp. 99–112. [ISBN 81-208-2036-3](#).
- [Sangave, Vilas Adinath](#) (2006) [1990], [Aspects of Jaina religion](#) (5 ed.), [Bharatiya Jnanpith](#), [ISBN 81-263-1273-4](#)
- Shah, Natubhai (1998). *Jainism: The World of Conquerors*. Volume I and II. Sussex: Sussex Academy Press. [ISBN 1-898723-30-3](#).
- Sharma, Arvind (2001). *Jaina Perspective on the Philosophy of Religion*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [ISBN 81-208-1760-5](#).
- Sonnleitner, Michael W (1985). *Gandhian Nonviolence: Levels of Satyagraha*. India: Abhinav Publications. [ISBN 81-7017-205-5](#).
- T. W. Rhys Davids (1980). *Sacred books of the East*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [ISBN 81-208-0101-6](#).
- Webb, Mark Owen. ["The Jain Philosophy"](#). *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. [Archived](#) from the original on 2 March 2008. Retrieved 2008-03-18.
- [Wiley, Kristi L.](#) (2009), [The A to Z of Jainism](#), **38**, Scarecrow, [ISBN 978-0-8108-6337-8](#)
- [Wiley, Kristi L.](#) (2004). [Historical Dictionary of Jainism](#). Scarecrow. [ISBN 978-0-8108-6558-7](#).
- [The Doctrine of Relative Pluralism \(anekāntavāda\)](#), Surendranath Dasgupta, 1940
- [Pravin K. Shah on Anekantvada](#)
- [The Indian-Jaina Dialectic of Syadvada](#) in Relation to Probability by [P. C. Mahalanobis](#), *Dialectica* 8, 1954, 95–111.
- [The Syadvada](#) System of Predication by [J. B. S. Haldane](#), *Sankhya* 18, 195–200, 1957.
- [Anekantvada](#).
- [The Pluralism Project](#) at [Harvard University](#).