Truthfulness and Truth in Jaina Philosophy

Peter Flügel[*]

Truthfulness and truth are not clearly distinguished in Jaina scriptures. A maxim of speaking the truth is stated in the so-called "*satya-mahāvrata*", which Jain ascetics recite twice a day during their obligatory *pratikramaṇa* ritual. In accordance with the preferred Jain method of negative determination, the general principle of truthful speech is treated in terms of its characteristic violations, *aticāra*, that is, as the opposite of speaking non-truth, *a-satya*.[1] Normative principles such as this are constitutive for Jain discourse to the extent that they are used by speech communities, both to generate and to interpret speech. The precise implications of the maxim of truthfulness for language usage are specified in form of a distinction of four types or 'species' of speech, *bhāsā-jāya <bhāṣā-jāta>*, which are at the centre of the Jain theory of discourse, supplemented by context-sensitive rules for proper ways of speaking, and examples. These analytical categories should be known and utilised by mendicants (ideally by all Jains) to prevent both the preparation and performance of violence, *ārambha*.

The rules and clauses for language usage expressed by the *bhāṣā-jāta* tetrad consider speech primarily from a normative point of view, rather than from the perspective of the intention of the speaker. In this respect, the analysis of the uses of language in the Jaina scriptures shares many characteristics with the approach of universal pragmatics in contemporary

philosophy:[2]

> 'A mendicant should know that there are four kinds of speech: The first is truth; the second is untruth; the third is truth mixed with untruth; what is neither truth, nor untruth, nor truth mixed with untruth, that is the fourth kind of speech: neither truth nor untruth' (Āyāra 2.4.1.4).[3]

Notably, the same scheme of four modes is applied to speech and to cognition (*maṇa* <*manas*>) or knowledge (*ṇāṇa* <*jñāna*>) (Viy 622b/8.7.1b, 874b/15.1.4). Hence, the four *bhāsā-gutti*s <*bhāṣā-gupti*s>, or controls of speech, and the four *maṇa-gutti*s <*mano-gupti*s>, or controls of the inner sense, are both characterised by the same terms in Utt 24.19–23. The four modes, thus, represent general attitudes towards truth, both in mind and in speech:

1. *saccā* <*satyā*>	truth
2. *mosā* <*mṛṣā*>	untruth
3. *saccā-mosā* <*satyā-mṛṣā*>	truth mixed with untruth
4. *asaccā-mosā* <*asatyā-mṛṣā*>	neither truth nor untruth

The formal structure of the four alternatives (tetra-lemma) is known as *catuṣ-koṭi* in Buddhist literature, but used differently here.[4] As the frequent use of the four alternatives (*catur-bhaṅga* or *catur-bhaṅgī*) as a classificatory scheme in Thāṇa IV, for instance, indicates,[5] the *catuṣ-koṭi* is used in Jain scholasticism in a similar way as the *nikṣepa* pattern, described by BRUHN–HÄRTEL (1978: v) as a formal 'dialectical technique (often employed in a "pseudo-exegetical function")'.[6]

JACOBI (1884: 150 n. 2) understood the first three modes to refer to assertions and the fourth to injunctions.

According to Paṇṇ 860 (255b), the first two modes are distinct (*pajjattiyā* <*paryāptā*>) ways of speaking, which can be analysed in terms of the true / false distinction,[7] and the third and fourth are indistinct (*apajjattiyā* <*aparyāptā*>) ways of speaking, whose validity or non-validity is indeterminable. The sub-categories of distinct speech are true speech (*satyā bhāṣā*) and wrong or false speech (*mṛsā bhāṣā*), and the sub-categories of indistinct speech are true-as-well-as-false speech (*satyā-mṛsā bhāṣā*) and neither-true-nor-false speech (*asatyā-mṛsā bhāṣā*). A *muni* should use only the first and the last mode of speech, and avoid the remaining two 'by all means' (DVS$_2$ 7.1) in order to minimise harm:

> 'A monk or a nun, considering well, should use true and accurate speech, or speech which is neither truth nor untruth (i.e. injunctions); for such speech is not sinful, blameable, rough, stinging, &c.' (Āyāra 2.4.1.7).[8]

(a) Speaking truthfully can either be interpreted ethically, as straightforward and accurate talk (on-record), or ontologically, as an assertion of the way things are.[9] Both perspectives can be found in the Jain and non-Jain commentary literature alike,[10] often mixed together, as the identical characterisation of the four *gupti*s of mind and speech illustrates. *Satyā bhāṣā* refers both to the psychological and the normative conditions of truthfulness, that is, sincere, grammatically accurate and contextually acceptable speech, and to propositional truth.[11] It is explicitly recognised in the Jain scriptures (though not in these terms) that, as a speech act, propositional language has also an expressive and normative content. The normative, the expressive, and the propositional components of spoken language are altogether necessary to communicate something. Paṇṇ 862 states that 'the truth or validity of the speech depends on various situations and conditions' (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 325). Ten different dimensions or 'validity conditions' of truthful

speech are distinguished[12] (the compound "*saccā <satyā>* can be translated as 'sincere' or 'true' 'according to the conventions of ___'):[13]

1. *jaṇavaya-saccā <janapada-satyā>* Country
2. *sammata-saccā <sammata-satyā>* Consensus
3. *ṭhavaṇā-saccā <sthāpanā-satyā>* Representation
4. *ṇāma-saccā <nāma-satyā>* Name
5. *rūva-saccā <rūpa-satyā>* Form
6. *paḍucca-saccā <pratītya-satyā>* Confirmation
7. *vavahāra-saccā <vyavahāra-satyā>* Custom
8. *bhāva-saccā <bhāva-satyā>* Inner Meaning
9. *joga-saccā <yoga-satyā>* Practice
10. *ovamma-saccā <aupamya-satyā>* Analogy

The same list is given and explained in *Mūlācāra* 5.111–116, with exception of *yoga-satyā*, which is replaced by category No. 8 *sambhāvanā-satyā*, translated by OKUDA (1975: 128) as 'truth of possibilities' (*Möglichkeitswahrheit*; see *infra* p. 161).[14] There is no apparent systematic connection between the categories in this list. Yet, the list is clearly informed by the four 'doors of disquisition' (*aṇuogaddāra <anuyoga-dvāra>*) of canonical hermeneutics (AṇD 75), especially by the method of contextual interpretation (*aṇugama <anugama>*) through progressive specification via fixed standpoints (*naya*) (AṇD 601–606).[15] The occurrence of the terms *nāma*, *sthāpanā* and *bhāva* indicates the deliberate incorporation of a variant of the 'canonical' *nikkheva <nikṣepa>*, as BHATT (1978: xv, 20) suggested, although the *davva <dravya>* standpoint is missing.[16] A *nikṣepa* is a scholastic scheme which delineates fixed perspectives for the analysis of the principal dimensions of the possible contextual meanings of a word (contemporary linguistics is still struggling to establish comparable categories). The original purpose of the list of ten, as a whole, may have been similar. That is, assessing the meaning of an utterance from several commonly relevant perspectives.[17]

Most categories are self-explanatory. Truthful utterances based on the linguistic conventions of a country are explained by the commentaries through the example that 'in Konkan *piccaṃ* is said for *payas* and that by the *gopāla* the lotus is called *aravinda* only' (SCHUBRING 2000: 157 n. 4, § 74). Because terms such as these are synonyms, they are all equally true.[18] Similarly, what is accepted by many people, i.e. linguistic expressions, is conventionally true (*sammata-satyā*).[19] Pragmatic theories of truth would fall under this perspective. A figurative representation, such as a statue which is not god itself, may itself not be accurate, but that what it symbolises can be recognized as true (*sthāpanā-satyā*).[20] The same applies to a name such as Devadatta or 'given by god' (*nāma-satyā*) (MĀc 113).[21] Allusions to external appearance in form of prototypes such as 'white cranes' (not all cranes are white) are examples of *rūpa-satyā*.[22] According to the commentators Haribhadra (PaṇṇV) and Malayagiri (PaṇṇṬ), the term *pratītya-satyā* designates an utterance which is true only under certain conditions, and thus predicated on empirical confirmation.[23] Examples are relative size ('this is long') or the relative state of transformation of objects at a given time (cf. MĀc 114).[24] Like other conventional expressions which, under certain conditions, could equally be classified as 'truth-mixed-with-untruth', common or idiomatic utterances such as 'the *kūra* (i.e. the cooked rice) is cooking' (MĀc 114) are acceptable as customarily true (*vyavahāra-satyā*).[25] The Śvetâmbara commentators explain the inner truth (*bhāva-satyā*) expressed by certain utterances with the example of a 'white crane' (*śuklā balākā*),[26] which MĀc 113 uses to illustrate *rūpa-satyā*, whereas Vaṭṭakera interprets the term as designating the 'higher truth', i.e. saying something untrue in order to avoid injury to someone (MĀc 116). This perspective is also applied to other contexts in the Śvetâmbara texts Āyāra 2.4.1.6 and DVS 7.11. An example of truth based on association with practice (*yoga-satyā*) is to describe someone according to his / her activity,

for instance the designation *chattrī* (a *kṣatriya* who should protect his realm performs *chattra-yoga*), or *daṇḍī* (who performs *daṇḍa-yoga* or punishment).[27] Instead of *yoga-satyā*, the *Mūlācāra* 115 has *sambhāvanā-satyā*, which means that assuming the possibility of something is a valid condition of truthful language: 'If he wanted, he could do it. If Indra wanted, he could overturn the Jambudvīpa' (OKUDA 1975: 128). As an example of speaking the truth, using comparison or analogy (*aupamya-satyā*),[28] MĀc 116 mentions the word *palidovama* < *palyôpama*>, literally 'like a sack of corn', which designates a high number.[29] *Aṇuogaddārāiṃ* (AGD) 368–382 demonstrates the practical 'usefulness' of this simile through the *naya* method of progressive disambiguation.[30]

(b) Untruthful language or speaking untruthfully (*mṛṣā bhāṣā*) is the proscribed opposite of truth or truthfulness.[31] In contrast to the ten conditions of truth, featuring the semantics of propositional utterances, the ten conditions out of which untruth 'arises' (compound: "*nissiya* <*niḥsṛita*>"), listed in Paṇṇ 863, are primarily psycho-physical conditions.[32] According to SCHUBRING (2000: 157, § 69), 'speech springing from emotion is by itself understood as *mosā*.'[33] Eight of the ten categories overlap with the standard Jain list of the eighteen sources of sin (*pāva-ṭhāṇa* <*pāpa-sthāna*>),[34] starting with the four passions (*kasāya* <*kaṣāya*>), and attachment and aversion, which in the Paṇṇ are the sole cause of karmic bondage, disregarding *yoga*, or activity (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 384). Most types of untrue speech, conditioned by these factors, can be categorised as expressive utterances. The last two categories, *ākhyāyika-niḥsṛita*[35] and *upaghāta-niḥsṛita*,[36] do not refer merely to an underlying negative psycho-physical state in general, but to the unspecified psycho-physical conditions of two specific types of self-referentially defined commonly untrue speech acts—hearsay and false accusation—with predominately constantive and regulative attributes.

1. *koha-nissiya* *<krodha-niḥsrita>*   Anger
2. *māṇa-nissiya* *<māna-niḥsrita>*   Pride
3. *māyā-nissiya* *<māyā-niḥsrita>*   Deceit
4. *lobha-nissiya* *<lobha-niḥsrita>*   Greed
5. *pejja-nissiya* *<premana-niḥsrita>*   Attachment
6. *dosa-nissiya* *<dveṣa-niḥsrita>*   Aversion
7. *hāsa-nissiya* *<hāsya-niḥsrita>*   Ridicule
8. *bhaya-nissiya* *<bhaya-niḥsrita>*   Fear
9. *akkhāiya-nissiya* *<ākhyāyika-niḥsrita>*   Hearsay
10. *uvaghāya-nissiya* *<upaghāta-niḥsrita>*   False Accusation

CAILLAT (1991: 11) observed that the Paṇṇ presents the *kaṣāya*s as the cause of untruth, not of injury, as in Āyāra 2.4.1.1 and DVS 7.11. This change of perspective, from *ahiṃsā* to "*satya* as the main criterion, may reflect the shift of emphasis in classical Jain *karman* theory from act to intention. The ten categories seem to have in common that they refer to acts which, intentionally or unintentionally, produce unwholesome perlocutionary effects in the addressee (and the speaker as well). They are either factually false, ethically wrong or both.[37]

(g) The category 'partially true speech'[38] or 'truth-mixed-with-untruth' (*saccā-mosā bhāsā* *<satyā-mrṣā bhāṣā>*) should not be mixed up with the conditionally true standpoints of *syād-vāda*, which apply only to valid statements, not to false knowledge (*apramāṇa*). 'Truth-mixed-with-untruth' designates intentionally or unintentionally ambiguous or unclear speech, which is strictly prohibited.[39] The meaning of the term is explained by DVS 7.4–10:

4. But this and that topic which confines the Eternal within limits—this half-true speech the wise [monk] should avoid.

5. By a speech which is untrue, though its appearance is that of a true one, a man is touched by sin, how much more a man who speaks plain untruth!' (DVS₁

7.4).[40]

Satyā-mṛṣā bhāṣā is sinful language, based on the whole on non-universalisable ethical principles. For instance, the language of heretical forest-monks, who do not abstain from killing, whose thought, speech and behaviour is not well controlled:

> 'They employ speech that is true and untrue at the same time: "do not beat me, beat others; do not abuse me, abuse others; do not capture me, capture others; do not torment me, torment others; do not deprive me of life, deprive others of life"' (Suy 2.2.21).

The ten types of truth-mixed-with-untruth listed in Paṇṇ 865[41] do not explicitly address expressive or regulative aspects of speech acts, but only propositional content; despite the fact that performatives can also be both true and untrue. According to the commentaries, all types deal with indiscriminate speech, and with semantic and logical fallacies, such as category mistakes regarding the quality or quantity of objects or temporal modalities which can be easily 'mixed up' (compound: "*missiyā <miśritā>*"), for instance in utterances designating part-whole relationships.

1. *uppaṇṇa-missiyā <utpanna-miśritā>*   Born
2. *vigaya-missiyā <vigata-miśritā>*   Destroyed
3. *uppaṇṇa-vigaya-missiyā <utpanna-vigata-miśritā>*   Born-Destroyed
4. *jīva-missiyā <jīva-miśritā>*   Life
5. *ajīva-missiyā <ajīva-miśritā>*   Matter
6. *jīvājīva-missiyā <jīvājīva-miśritā>*   Life-Matter
7. *aṇanta-missiyā <ananta-miśritā>*   Infinite
8. *paritta-missiyā <parīta-miśritā>*   Separate
9. *addhā-missiyā <adhva-miśritā>*   Time
10. *addhāddhā-missiyā <ardhādhva-miśritā>*   Halftime

The list of ten modalities evidently reflects general issues of

particular concern for Jain doctrine. It can be thematically
subdivided in two triplets and two pairs. The first triplet—
utpanna, vigata, utpanna-vigata—addresses unclear distinctions
concerning life and death. The commentators explain the
meaning of *utpanna-miśritā* as speaking in non-specific ways
about the born, mixed with references to the yet unborn; for
instance birth occurring in this or that village or town, that ten
or more or less boys were born ('ten boys were born in this
village today') etc.[42] In the same way, *vigata-miśritā* refers to
cases of 'stating mortality in an indefinite way, e.g. saying
that ten people have died in this village, etc.'
(RATNACANDRA 1988 IV: 400).[43] *Utpanna-vigata-miśritā*
refers to both true and false, or contradictory assertions
(*visaṃvāda*) regarding manifestations of both birth and death.[44]
The second triplet—*jīva, ajīva, jīvājīva*—similarly addresses
the problem of pointing in a general way to 'great numbers'
of either living or dead beings, or quantities of mixed living
and dead beings.[45] Life (*jīva*) in abstract and concrete form
can be confused through vague language, such as the language
of sets (*rāśi*), or other numerical expressions. The same applies
to matter (*ajīva*), and both life and matter (*jīvājīva*). The
consequence of imprecise language may be unintentional
violence against individual living beings (in a 'heap of dead
beings'). According to *Āvassaya-nijjutti* (ĀvNi 8.56–100), one
of the principal heretics of the canonical period, Rohagutta,
committed the mistake of mixing up categories by positing a
third principle, *no-jīva* or the half-living, which mediates
between *jīva* and *ajīva*. Hence, his heresy was called *terāsiyā*.[46]
The pair *ananta* and *parīta* addresses indiscriminate language
regarding aspects of finite-infinite, part-whole, or singular term-
existence relationships. The commentaries explain *ananta-miśritā*
with reference to the case of certain plants, for instance root
vegetables such as radish (*mūlaka*), which have only one body,
yet are composed of an infinite number of souls (*ananta-
jīva*).[47] The category *parīta-miśritā* focuses, conversely, for

instance on the independence and separateness of each individual element within a composite form of vegetation.[48] The two ontological levels of the relationship between one and many can easily be mixed up in these cases; which has potential ethical (karmic) consequences. One of the principle concerns of the *Pannavaṇā*, highlighted in Malayagiri's commentary, is the difference between the categories infinite (*ananta*) and uncountable (*asaṃkhyāta*).[49] With regard to *adhva*, time, speech is both true and untrue if one says, for some reason, that 'it is night' during the daytime, or 'get up, it is day' when it is night.[50] The same applies to the part of a measure of time, or *ardhādhva*, such as a *prahara*, a quarter of the bright or dark period of the day.[51] The statements may be true in as much as time in general is concerned, but false with regard to time in particular (i.e. it may be bright, although technically it is still night).[52] Examples for a potential mix up of the modalities of time, which may have negative moral consequences in cases of promises for instance, are given in Āyāra 2.4.2, and in DVS 7.6–10 as paradigmatic cases for *satyā-mṛṣā* speech. The illocutionary form of these sentences is not essential, since they can be transformed into propositions of the form: 'x promises (commands etc.), that p':[53]

> '6. Such speech therefore, as e.g. "we [shall] go", "we shall say", "we shall have to do that", or: "I shall do that", or "he shall do that", 7. uncertain in the future or with regard to a matter of the present [or] of the past, a wise [monk] should avoid. 8.9. If [a monk] does not know, [or] has some doubt about, a matter which concerns past, present and future, he should not say: "it is thus"; 10. (this he should do only) when there is no room for doubt' (DVS$_1$ 7.6–10).[54]

Somadeva, in his *Yaśastilaka* of 959 CE (YT, p. 349–350), mentions a similar example of a statement which is on the whole true but to some extent false, that is, when someone

'after promising to give something at the end of a fortnight, gives it after a month or a year' (HANDIQUI 1968: 265). He also mentions the statement 'he cooks food or weaves clothes' as one which is to some extent true but on the whole false because 'properly speaking, one cooks rice etc. and weaves yarn'. A different example of mixed speech, mentioned in Viy 18.7.1 (749a), are utterances of someone who is possessed. The fact that this case, referring to an existentially mixed psycho-physical state rather than to semantic ambiguity, cannot be easily fitted into any of the ten categories illustrates that the list is not exhaustive. From other viewpoints, the examples may also fit the categories of the other lists.

All of the ten enumerated modalities seem to refer to utterances in which the universal and the particular, or modalities of time, quantifiers, or other categories,[55] are mixed up in an indiscriminate and hence ambiguous way.[56] Though the mistakes discussed in the texts seem to be primarily based on indiscriminate cognition, producing objectionable uncertainty (cf. Āyāra 2.4.1–2), the ten categories are very broad and can cover a great variety of motives, logical and semantic conundrums, such as vagueness or paradoxes, and linguistic forms and discursive strategies, such as off-record uses of metaphor, similes, veiled speech and politeness, which GRICE (1975) and BROWN-LEVINSON (1978) have analysed as popular forms for saying one thing and meaning another.[57] These phenomena deserve more detailed analysis in future studies. For the purpose of this essay, a few comparative notes on the implications of the findings for the question of the stance of Jain philosophy on the law of non-contradiction must suffice.

For PRIEST–ROUTLEY (1989: 3), 'admission or insistence, that some statement is both true and false, in a context where not everything is accepted or some things are rejected, is a sure sign of a paraconsistent approach—in fact

a dialethic approach', i.e. the assumption that 'the world is inconsistent'. The Greek word *dialetheia* (two-way truth) refers to a true contradiction facing both truth and falsity.[58] PRIEST–ROUTLEY (1983: 17) were the first to point out parallels between Jaina logic and modern discussive logic, but argue, like most logicians before them, that Jain perspectivism is predicated on the rejection of the law of contradiction.[59] However, GANERI (2002: 274) demonstrated in his re-construction of the assumptions underlying the method of seven-fold predication (*sapta-bhaṅgī*), based on an extension of discussive logic via modalised many-valued truth-tables, that Jain logic 'does not involve any radical departure from classical logic … The underlying logic *within* each standpoint is classical, and it is further assumed that each standpoint or participant is internally consistent.' The findings of BALCEROWICZ (2003: 64) on the contextual logic of the seven *naya*s concur with this general conclusion. Both authors show that Jain logic is context-sensitive and a quasi-functional system.

To *syād-vāda* and *anekānta-vāda* the Jain *catuṣ-koṭi* of the modes of speech can be added, as another example of 'Jain logic' which clearly operates within the confines of the law of non-contradiction, and does not need to be interpreted as a form of scepticism, nor of syncretism predicated on the notion of a total truth integration of all viewpoints, as MATILAL (1981) argues. Our brief glance at the Jain interpretation of the third mode of the so-called 'four-valued logic' of the *catuṣ-koṭi*, applied to language usage, that is, the explicit exclusion of the values 'false' and 'both true and false', showed that 'Jain logic' does not 'flatly deny'[60] the law of non-contradiction. The examples in Jain scriptures for modes of speech which are both-true-and-false, and their explicit rejection, demonstrate, on the contrary, that Jain philosophy is unequivocally opposed to violations of the law of non-

contradiction. This conclusion is also borne out by the Jain analysis of the temporal aspects of action (Viy 1.1.1=13a, 9.33.2d = 484a), which explicitly denies the possibility that an action that is being performed is not equal to the completed action, as the heretic Jamāli held ('has the bed been made or is it being made'). The question of the identity of an action in time has important consequence for the evaluation of karmic consequences, also of speech-acts. Contrary to PRIEST–ROUTLEY's (1989) intuitions, it seems, the main technique of argumentation used by Jain philosophers in all these cases resembles Aristotle's refutation of Heraclitus and other 'paraconsistent' thinkers in ancient Greece:

> 'Key parts of his analysis involved the use of time to avoid contradiction—instead of saying that a changing thing was both in a given state and also not in that state, it was said that the thing was in that state at time t1, but not in that state at a different time t2—and the theory of potentiality—required to reunify these now temporarily isolated states as parts of the one (and same) change. The appeal to different temporal quantifiers illustrated the *method of* (*alleged*) *equivocation* used since ancient times to avoid contradiction and reinforce consistency hypothesis; namely, where both A and – A appear to hold, find a respect or factor or difference r such that it can be said that A holds in respect r1 and – A in respect r2. It can then be said that a contradiction resulted only by equivocation on respect or factor r. Often however the method of alleged equivocation does not work in a convincing way, and it breaks down in an irreparable way with the semantic paradoxes, as the Megarians were the first to realize' (PRIEST–ROUTLEY 1989: 8).

Speech that is both-true-and-untrue is rejected in the Jain scriptures, because it mixes aspects which can be

discriminated, if necessary with the help of the method of perspective variation in time. To what extent ancient Jain philosophers would have agreed with Aristotle on this point is a question which can only be clearly answered in a separate study. It seems to me that the Jain theory of time is fundamental, also for Jain perspectivism.

(d) The most interesting of the four modes of speech (and cognition) is 'speaking neither truth nor untruth' (*asaccā-mosā*). That is, speech to which the true / false distinction is not applicable. Twelve types of the *asatyā-mṛṣā bhāṣā* are distinguished in Paṇṇ 866 = Viy 10.3.3 (499b):[61]

1. *āmantaṇī <āmantraṇī>*   Address
2. *āṇavaṇī <ājñāpanī>*   Order
3. *jāyaṇī <yācanā>*   Request
4. *pucchaṇī <pṛcchanī>*   Question
5. *paṇṇavaṇī <prajñāpanī>*   Communication
6. *paccakkhāṇī <pratyākhyānī>*   Renunciation
7. *icchāṇulomā <icchānulomā>*   Consent
8. *aṇabhiggahiyā <anabhigṛhītā>* Unintelligible
9. *abhiggahiyā <abhigṛhītā>*   Intelligible
10. *saṃsaya-karaṇī <saṃśaya-karaṇī>* Doubt-Creating
11. *voyaḍā <vyākṛtā>*   Explicit
12. *avvoyaḍā <avyākṛtā>*   Implicit

Nine of the twelve categories are also listed in Māc 5.118–119. The categories 1–7 are identical in both texts. Of the last five, only *saṃśaya* (No. 10) is mentioned by Vaṭṭakera, and a category labelled *aṇakkhara <anakṣara>*, 'incomprehensible', which can be read as an equivalent of *aṇabhiggahiyā <anabhigṛhītā>* (No. 8, maybe also incorporating aspects of No. 12).[62]

Speaking neither-truth-nor-untruth is interpreted by JACOBI (1884: 150 n. 2, 151)[63] and MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 325 f.) as referring to injunctions. However, considering the

great variety of listed speech acts (only the first three are injunctions), it seems better to use AUSTIN's (1962) term 'performatives', which are by definition neither true nor false, to characterise the first seven terms.[64] The last five terms cover aspects which GRICE (1975) discussed under the conversational maxims of relation ('relevance') and manner ('avoid obscurity'). In Austin's terminology, addressing, ordering, requesting, and questioning etc. are all illocutionary acts. Questions,[65] commands, and exclamations are not propositions, since they can not be asserted or denied; that is, they are neither true nor false. Imperatives (directives), such as orders and requests, and regulatives (commissives), such as consenting and renouncing (promising, vowing etc.), through which the speaker commits him / herself to perform certain actions in future, imply normative conditions which ought to be fulfilled, but which are not fulfilled yet. In this sense, the propositional content is also neither true nor false. Truth, and its opposite, falsity, are properties that belong only to propositions. Propositions are statements that either assert or deny that something is the case. Not all sentences are true or false, because not all sentences make such claims. Commands, questions, and expressions of volition neither assert nor deny that something is the case, and are, consequently, neither true nor false.

ARISTOTLE (PH 4) already noted that 'every sentence is not a proposition; only such are propositions as have in them either truth or falsity. Thus a prayer is a sentence, but is neither true nor false.' Problems related to the ontological and truth-functional status of future events and the grammatical future were also discussed in Greek philosophy, which may or may not have influenced Indian philosophy in this point.[66]274 In *De Interpretatione* (PH), ARISTOTLE offers the following solution to a paradox posed by Diodoros Cronus as to the truth-value of the sentence 'Will there be a sea battle

tomorrow?' Any definite answer ('yes' or 'no') to this indecidable question is presently neither true nor false, but if in future one becomes true, then the other becomes false:

> 'One of the two propositions in such instances must be true and the other false, but we cannot say determinately that this or that is false, but must leave the alternative undecided. One may indeed be more likely to be true than the other, but it cannot be either actually true or actually false. It is therefore plain that it is not necessary that of an affirmation and a denial one should be true and the other false. For in the case of that which exists potentially, but not actually, the rule which applies to that which exists actually does not hold good' (PH 9).

For Aristotle, as for the Jains, it is both unethical and factually wrong to assume the future is determined, since actions evidently influence events. Although it is not entirely clear what exactly Aristotle and the Jain author(s) had in mind, in both cases the commitment to free will and to the logic of events overrules the logic of propositions. Generally, empirical facts can neither be proven true nor false by logical necessity: 'Even if I say "It's raining now" when the sun is shining, I have not said something that is necessarily false, just something that happens to be false' (HARNAD 1999: 1).[67] From a purely logical point of view, Bertrand RUSSELL (1905) showed that all predicates with variables are not propositions to which a truth value can be attached in an unambiguous way. Hence they are neither true nor false. However, they can be transformed into propositions by replacing the variable with a value or a quantifier.[68] It is, of course, difficult to say to what extent ancient Jain philosophers already shared certain intuitions with modern logicians.

The first seven categories, sometimes combined, cover most speech acts a Jain ascetic would conventionally use in

contexts of monastic life;[69] for instance taking vows
(*paccakkhāṇa*), requesting permission (*āpucchaṇā*), ordering
(*ājñā*), confessing (*ālocanā*), begging forgiveness (*kṣamāpaṇā*)
etc. *Āmantaṇī* <*āmantraṇī*> speech or language, for instance,
is 'used for attracting somebody's attention, a vocative word
or expression' (GHATAGE 2003 III.2: 1001), for instance 'O
Devadatta!'[70] MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 325) gives the following
examples of an address and an order: 'when a person wanting
John to come near him says "O! John", or 'when a person
says to another person, "Go ahead".' However, not in all
contexts are such expressions neither-true-nor-false. Under
certain circumstances, the first example may represent or can
be read as an 'indirect' or 'implicit performative' speech act
clad in form of an address, and it could be argued that, in
certain contexts, the second example does not correspond to
the prescription in Āyāra 2.4 for mendicants to avoid pragmatic
interventions.

The last five terms of the list are of a different nature.
The term *aṇabhiggahiyā*<*anabhigṛhītā*> refers to 'unintelligible
or incomprehensible speech' (RATNACANDRA 1988 I: 156),
which is either 'irrelevant' (DELEU (1970: 169) or / and
'unacceptable' (GHATAGE 1996 I: 237), but neither-true-nor-
false. Its antonym, *abhiggahammi boddhavvā*, intelligible
instruction, refers to 'clear and intelligible language'
(RATNACANDRA 1988 IV: 351), which is 'relevant' and
'acceptable', and neither-true-nor-false.[71] Malayagiri's
commentary[72] explains the difference between irrelevant and
relevant speech through the following example: 'to the question
"What shall I do now?" the answer "Do as you like" is
aṇabhiggahiyā, the answer "Do this, do not that!" is
abhiggahiyā' (DELEU 1970: 169).

It is not entirely clear why *saṃsaya-karaṇī bhāsā*
<*saṃśaya-karaṇī bhāṣā*>, 'ambiguous language which causes
doubt' (RATNACANDRA 1988 IV: 570), is regarded as

neither-true-nor-false, and therefore permissible. It must be assumed that only the use of strategically ambiguous messages for the purpose of creating *vairāgya*-shocks is seen as legitimate, but not language which creates doubt about Jainism in the minds of believers. He seems to follow Malayagiri (PaṇṇṬ), who argued that from the *niścaya-naya* not only *satya-mṛṣā* but also *asatyā-mṛṣā* statements are false—'if they are spoken with the intention of deceiving others' (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 346). However, Viy 18.7.1 (749a) states that, by definition, the speech of a Kevalin, because it is harmless, can only be true or neither-true-nor false.[73] The statement associates higher moral truth with this type of speech, which can thus be compared with the 'twilight-language' (*sandhā-bhāṣā*) of Tantric Buddhism, which is also characterised as neither-true-nor-false.[74] Jambūvijaya's edition of the Ṭhāṇa 4.23 (238) contains the following commentary of According to OKUDA (1975: 129), MĀc 119 explains *saṃsaya-vayaṇī* <*saṃśaya-vacana*> as 'speech which expresses doubt'. But its commentator Vasunandin (11th–12th century) interprets this as 'speech of children and old people' as well as the sounds of (five-sensed) 'roaring buffalos' etc., which cause doubt as to their meaning, while the Digambara authors Aparājita and Āśādhara and the Śvetâmbara Haribhadra commenting on DVS 7, read *saṃsaya-karaṇī* simply as 'ambiguous speech' (*anekârtha-sādhāraṇā*). Haribhadra classifies speech of children as *aṇakkhara* <*anakṣara*>, incomprehensible, which also figures as the ninth and last category listed in MĀc 119, which Vasunandin reserves for expressions of animals of two-four senses, and for sounds created by snipping fingers etc. (OKUDA 1975: 129).[75]

Vyākṛtā bhāṣā refers to clear distinct speech with explicit unambiguous meaning (RATNACANDRA 1988 IV: 511).[76] There is no example given by the commentaries for distinct speech which is neither-true-nor-untrue. *Avyākṛtā-bhāṣā*>, refers to indistinct involuted or poetic speech consisting of obscure

or unintelligible words 'with deep and profound meaning' (RATNACANDRA 1988 IV: 445; cf. GHATAGE 2001 II: 800).[77] *Mantra*s or *sūtra*s may be fitting examples. The fact that the *Mūlācāra* does not mention these two categories reinforces the suspicion that they are redundant, and overlapping with the category of incomprehensible language.

The most interesting case is *pannavaṇī-bhāsā <prajñāpanī-bhāṣā>*, explanation, the generic term which Vardhamāna Mahāvīra himself employs in the scriptures[78] to designate his discourse, which also gives the *Pannavaṇā-suttaṃ* its name. Like all descriptions of speech acts, *pannavaṇī* is a somewhat ambiguous term, because it refers both to the illocutionary act, locutionary content, and perlocutionary effect of proclaiming something. This ambiguity is reflected in different translations of the word. SCHUBRING (2000 § 69: 158) and DELEU (1970: 169) translate *pannavaṇī* as 'communication' (*Mitteilung*). According to SCHUBRING (2000 § 69: 157 f.), the examples for 'communication' given in Viy 10.3.3 (499b) = Paṇṇ 866, 'We want to [*wollen*] lie down' (*āsaissāmo*) etc., refer to 'expressions of an intention' (to do something). However, DELEU (1970: 169) and LALWANI (1985: 133) translate *āsaissāmo <āśayiṣyāmaḥ>* as 'we will lie down' and 'we shall lie down' respectively, that is, as the description of a future action or state.[79] MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 211), who points to kindred views in the Pāli text *Puggala-paññatti*, prefers the word 'describing' as a translation of *pannavaṇī* which he renders as 'speech that intends to describe a thing'. In this, he follows the 13th century commentary of Ācārya Malayagiri who stated that *pannavaṇī* 'means the speech that intends to describe the thing (or event) [as it is]'.[80] It is a form of *asaccā-mosā* speech, 'a speech which has nothing to do with norm (validity or invalidity) but which only describes the thing (or event)': 'To be more explicit, the speech which has nothing to do with religious dos and do-nots but which simply describes

the thing is called *Prajñāpanī.*'[81] MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 212) cites the example quoted by the commentator Malayagiri's *Prajñāpanā-ṭīkā*, 'Those who refrain from killing living beings live long and enjoy good health (in the next birth)',[82] and notes: 'The *gāthā* in point contains no command "do not kill" but simply describes the fact that those who do not kill live long and remain healthy.' Such speech 'has nothing to do with religious dos and do-nots' (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 211). Hence, it should be distinguished from implicit performative speech. But, of course, it may be interpreted as such by a listener who infers an 'ought' from the 'is'. MONIER-WILLIAMS' (1986: 659) *Sanskrit - English Dictionary* translates the causative *prajñāpana* as 'statement, assertion'. LALWANI (1985 IV: 133) apparently follows the *Illustrated Ardhamāgadhī Dictionary* of RATNACANDRA (1988 III: 443), based on Malayagiri, in using the word 'advice' (*upadeśa*).[83] What is probably meant by the term *pannavaṇī* is that from the conventional point if view, which underlies the Jain '*catuṣ-koṭi*' of language usage, the testimony of an authoritative person is neither true nor untrue, because its meaning may be incomprehensible for a hearer, similarly to unintelligible utterances of non-enlightened creatures. With imperatives and addresses expressing universal truths or ideals has in common that no referent exists *in re* at a given place and point of time (as for instance in Malayagiri's example which should not be read as a prediction relating to a specific individual). The multidimensional implications of a general statement or rule such as this cannot be understood entirely in an instant, as WITTGENSTEIN (1953: 53–55, § 138 40) noted in his remarks on the relation between meaning and use of a word (ib., pp. 190 ff., § 138 f.). Moreover, the example given by the commentaries concerning the necessary link between non-violence and health cannot be proved or disproved from a conventional perspective. It must be accepted on the basis of the authority of the speaker. Interestingly enough, the two

truth theory is not invoked by the commentaries in defence of the concept of transcendental speech, being neither-true-nor-false, in spite of its capability to immunise any statement against criticism.[84]

Paṇṇ 832–857 gives another example for speech which is neither-true-nor-false by discussing the question of the 'congruity of grammatical and natural gender and number' (SCHUBRING 2000 § 74: 158). It argues that words such as *go*, cow, which express (genderless) universals but are employed in masculine singular, are not false or both-true-and-false, say, with regard to female cows, but neither-true-nor-false. The same applies to imperatives (*ājñāpanī*), since 'we may order a person of any gender and this person may or may not carry out our orders' (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 326).[85]

The last of the four variants of *ohāraṇī-bhāsā* <*avadhāraṇī-bhāsā*>, or determinate speech, is another example of speech which is neither-true-nor-false. Reflexive expressions such as 'I believe' or 'I think' are said to be capable of expressing any of the four modes of speech, depending on whether they serve religion (*ārāhiya* <*ārādhita*>), in which case they are true by definition, harm religion (*virāhiya* <*virādhita*>), in which case they are false, both serve and harm religion, in which case they are true-as-well-as-false, or whether they do neither, in which case they are neither-true-nor-false (Paṇṇ 830–831 [246b]).[86]

The examples show that in the Jain philosophy of speech pragmatic efficacy, that is, non-violence, supersedes propositional truth:[87]

'It goes with the sphere of *ethics* that all four modes of speech, and consequently the mode of wrong speech as well, are admitted, provided they are employed in a pious way of mind (*āuttaṃ=samyak*), while even true speech coming from a sinner's mouth

will count for nothing (Pannav. 268a)' (SCHUBRING
2000 § 74: 158).

Conversely, as mentioned before, 'a mode of speech springing
from emotion is by itself understood as *mosā*' (SCHUBRING
(2000 § 74: 157). In other words, the speaker's state of mind,
his / her beliefs, attitudes or intentions (if not his / her *Being*),
and the specific pragmatic context is decisive, not the words
themselves, or their propositional meaning. Arguments relating
to the 'higher truth' of morality based on similar considerations.
HANDIQUI (1968: 266) notes that the 10th century Digambara
ācārya Somadeva is more concerned with ethics than with
propositional truth:

> 'Somadeva appears in certain circumstances to
> attach greater importance to self-preservation and
> philanthropic considerations than to speaking the truth.
> He opines that the truth must not be spoken if it is
> likely to endanger others and bring inevitable ruin to
> oneself.'

Another example of this attitude is given by the
Śvetâmbara Ācārya Hemacandra who, in his 12th century
Yogaśāstra (Yś 2.61) and self-commentary, narrates that the
sage Kauśika, who was famous for speaking the truth, 'went
to hell because accurate information given by him led to the
capture and killing of a band of robbers' (cited by HANDIQUI
1968: 266 n. 4):

> 'On the other hand (*api*), even though a statement
> may be true, it should not be spoken if it causes
> affliction to others [This is] because, even if it is
> accepted [by all the people] in the world, Kauśika was
> sent to hell [on account of making such a statement]'
> (YŚ 2.61).[88]

The explanations of the four modes of speech in
canonical Jain literature and its medieval Sanskrit commentaries

show that they are conceived as meta-rules, on a level of abstraction comparable to the discourse ethics of universal pragmatics, while the sub-categories and examples correspond to the level of empirical semantics and pragmatics. The levels of abstraction of the lists of examples in the commentaries vary, since the Jain lists are relatively unsystematic, although some may have been intended as scholastic devices for cumulative indexication *qua* fixed analytical perspectives. From the point of view of comparative analytical philosophy, some examples could serve as illustrations for one or other of the conversational postulates *à la* Grice ('be relevant' etc.), Searle, or Habermas, while others can be related to the modern logical investigations of vagueness, category mistakes, quantifiers, or modalities of time in particular. In contrast to modern intentionalist semantics, Jain philosophers of language analyse examples of their four fundamental types of speech rarely with reference to the intention of the speaker, but prefer an objective or listener's standpoint. That is, they investigate the structure of the utterance as a whole, from the de-contextualised point of view of the four combinations of the basic true / false distinction, seen from the perspective of discourse ethics. The same perspective is preferred by universal pragmatics.

We can conclude from this brief discussion of the explanations of the four modes of speech in the Śvetâmbara canon and the commentaries that the rules of Jain discourse are less concerned with referential truth than with the pragmatics of speech;[89] in particular with the expression of the 'higher truth' of religious insight gained through direct self experience, and speaking in accordance with the ethics of non-violence. Yet, it would be a mistake to assume that truth in Jain discourse is always defined as an aspect of objective illocutionary force, depending on the form of the utterance and the intentional state of a speaker alone, without the need to be backed up by argument in processes of critical inquiry. The primacy of

pragmatic ethical and moral considerations, though considered from a monological perspective, makes the Jain theory of speech in many ways akin to universal pragmatics. It is apparent that, albeit unsystematically presented, for almost all universal pragmatic principles and conversational postulates there are functional equivalences amongst the Jain principles and rules of speech, which are by no means 'primitive' and 'ill-assorted', as for instance the philologist SCHUBRING (2000 § 74: 157) believed. Jain principles and rules of discourse are not mere examples of a culture-specific 'particularistic ethics', as LAIDLAW (1995: 14) argues, but form a 'comparatively systematic code which is well-grounded in objective considerations' (CAILLAT 1991: 14).

The analysis of the implications of the Jain maxim of truth and the general rules for proper language usage shows that the 'universal validity claims': propositional truth, normative rightness, and truthfulness are important considerations of Jain discourse ethics. Despite the primacy of non-violence and sincerity of expression, there are numerous examples for rules concerning referential truth, the ideal of univocal or straight (ṛju) speech, and the avoidance of deception, especially Āyāra 2.4.1.1, Āyāra 2.4.2.19, and DVS 8.46.[90] Such rules of avoidance of false representations (including false reference to past, present and future) and non-deceptive speech etc., can be understood as expressions of a pragmatic anti-illusionist (anti-Brāhmaṇic) realism, that is, as anti-deception strategies.

Although, the Jaina texts deliberately avoid defining certain words as 'sacred', for Jainism, too, 'correct speech is of religious value' (CAILLAT 1984: 71) in so far as the foremost requirement for the realisation of Jain norms is restraint (negative politeness) in mind, speech and action. The norms of unequivocal and grammatically correct signification and transmission of information are fundamental for the Jain understanding of proper language use. The religious ideal of

correct, truthful and non-violent manner of speech is summarised in the following passage, already quoted above:

> 'A monk or nun, putting aside wrath, pride, deceit, and greed, considering well, speaking with precision, what one has heard, not too quick, with discrimination, should employ language in moderation and restraint' (Āyār 2.4.2.19).[91]

What is manifest in this statement is that the Jain maxims themselves address the necessity of avoiding the violence and the consequential *karmic* results of 'flouting' the rules of proper speech by means of off-record strategies. At the same time, negative politeness (especially conventional indirectness) is regarded as mandatory for maintaining the vows of non-violence and truth in language usage. Recommended speech-strategies are usually forms of negative politeness, such as conventional indirectness, impersonalisation or nominalisation.[92] Impersonalisation by way of transforming directives and commissives into assertives, that is, a second-person performative perspective into a third-person observer's perspective, is the preferred method; evidently, because in this way 'illocutionary force switches over into the propositional content and thereby loses, if not its meaning, at least its force' (HABERMAS 1993: 27).[93] For instance, one should not say 'this should be done', but 'this is'. And one should not speak about forbidden subjects, such as business-choices etc., at all. One should not ask householders to do something, or 'forecast', or make promises to them (DVS$_2$ 7.46 f.; 51). Thus, although the Jain analysis of language usuage is essentially pragmatist, its rules of proper speech are predicated on the denial of pragmatic intent in favour of propositional statements whose pragmatic implications are, if at all, to be worked out by the listener, in a Gricean fashion:

> 'Guessing the teachers thought and the purport of his words, one should express one's assent, and execute

(what he desires to be done). An excellent pupil needs no express directions, or he is (at least) quickly directed; he always carries out his duties as he is told' (Utt 1.43 f.)

The running comparison between the theory of communicative action and Jain discourse ethics revealed significant similarities. Both approaches are rule-oriented, not goal oriented. That is, they are concerned with the general interest of many, not with the eudaemonic perspective of a single actor, despite the fact that the methods of universalisation are different. The respective ideals of consensus and non-violence leading to liberation mutually implicate each other. Basic non-violence is presupposed by communicative action, and the general interest of all is presupposed by universal non-violence. Though the criterion of generalisability, equal interest, is not theorized in Jain philosophy, and only touched upon with reference to specific negative rights such as the privileged case of the universal interest in avoiding pain,[94] the scope of the moral universe is extended from humanity to all living beings, whose essential spiritual equality is a fundamental principle of Jaina philosophy. The vanishing points of both theories, the ideal consensus of an infinite community of interpretation and the ideal omniscient observer, presuppose absolute knowledge and absolute consensus.

Yet, there are also significant differences. The main difference between the transcendental pragmatics of mutual recognition and the monadological Jain ethics of non-violence concerns the nature of the fundamental principles. The former is predicated on positive norms and the latter on norms of prohibition. The implicit method of universalisation of Jain ethics is the double negation, that is, the negation of non-generalisable statements. The resulting priority of physical non-action as a theoretical limiting case (not as a practical maxim) unburdens the doctrine of discussions of specific dilemmas of

norm application, thus safeguarding both generalisability and contextual determinateness, while maintaining a perspective of disengagement with the world and non-specific positive duties. The second main difference between the two types of discourse ethics concerns the moral division of labour presupposed by Jain norms of discourse, which privileges institutionally verified competent speakers or *āpta*. In contrast to universal pragmatics, Jain discourse ethics is not concerned with questions of human justice, but with the negative freedom of the individual.

Footnotes

[1] The earliest formulations of this maxim in the Āgamas use the expression *musā-vāya veramaṇaṃ* (S. *mṛsā-vāda viramaṇa*), cessation of telling lies. Like SCHUBRING (2000 § 171: 301), BRUHN (2003: 8) notes: 'The concept of "truth" is not uniform. But there are several references to the *kaṣāya*.s as the root of undesirable speech".

[2] This approach, which informs the following analysys, goes back to Peirce, Royce and Mead, and was further developed by APEL (1973) and HABERMAS (1980). The principal analytical question is not: What does it mean to understand an intention? But: What does it mean to understand a speech act? Universal pragmatics focuses not only on speech acts but on the normative presuppositions of 'linguistically mediated interaction' and on the social function of speech for the co-ordination of action. Building upon the work of analytical philosophers such as WITTGENSTEIN (1953), AUSTIN (1962), GRICE (1975), SEARLE (1969) and sociolinguists such as GUMPERZ (1964) and HYMES (1972), HABERMAS (1980) distinguishes three universal validity claims presupposed by every communicative action: 'truth', 'rightness' and 'truthfulness'.

[3] Āyāra 2.4.1.4: *aha bhikkhū jāṇejjā cattāri bhāsā-jāyāiṃ, taṃ jahā—saccam egaṃ paḍhamaṃ bhāsa-jāyaṃ, bīyaṃ mosaṃ, taiyaṃ saccā-mosaṃ, jaṃ ṇ'eva saccaṃ ṇ'eva mosaṃ ṇ'eva saccā-mosaṃ—asaccā-mosaṃ ṇāma taṃ cautthaṃ bhāsa-jāyaṃ.* CAILLAT (1991: 8 n.4) located the following parallels to the above *sūtra* in the Śvetâmbara canon: Utt 24.20–23, Ṭhāṇa 4.23 (238), Viy 13.7.1a (621a-b), Pannavaṇā 11 (860–866). See also Viy 16.2.2b (701a), 18.7.1 (749a), 19.8 (770b), Samavāya 13.1, and DVS 7.1–3. OHIRA (1994: 14, 155) is of the opinion that the

four modes were first taught at the time of DVS 7, which she dates between 5th–4th century BcE.

[4] In contrast to the debate on the use of the *catuṣ-koṭi* in 'Buddhist logic', focusing largely on the 'negative dialectic' of Nāgārjuna, the cited Jain cases indicate that the *catuṣ-koṭi* was used (at least by Jains) from early on as a scholastic frame for the discussion of logical alternatives, without specific doctrinal implications being connected with the frame itself. MURTI (1955: 129) noted early on: 'Four alternative views are possible on any subject'. Notably, the four alternatives in Āyāra 2.4.1.4 etc., are disjunctive, not additive, as stereotypical representations of 'Jaina Logic' generally assume. Because Jain usage of *catuṣ-koṭi*s was ignored, and because of the almost exclusive focus on Nāgārjuna, Buddhist scholars compared the 'four-cornered negation' only with the 'Jain relativism' in general. They derived the *catuṣ-koṭi* either speculatively from Jain *syād-vāda* (GUNARATNE 1980: 232) or vice versa (BAHM 1957: 128), or (and) contrasted it with 'the relativistic logic proposed by the Jains, to which Buddhism was opposed' (JAYATILLEKE 1967: 82). According to RAJU (1954), the mythical Sanjaya framed the four alternatives already in the 7th century BCE, negating all of them, whereas 'Jaina logicians saw a relative truth in each pole and thus adopted a more positive and determinate attitude toward our cognitions of the world.' For recent, less logocentric, views on Nāgārjuna, focusing on 'skillful means', see for instance JONES (1978), SCHROEDER (2000). A similar four-valued theory of truth was defended by the Megarians (PRIEST–ROUTLEY 1989: 13), which demonstrates that no specific philosophical position is associated with the form itself, only with its uses.

[5] See DUNDAS (2007: 50 f.) on the analogy between four types of armies and four types of ascetics in Ṭhāṇa 292 (4.280–1). ALSDORF (1966: 186 f., cf. 190 f.) discussed a different type of *catur-bhaṅga*s in Jaina literature, made up of combinations of two positive and two negative possibilities. He pointed out that the use of the 'fourfold combination' is 'very typical of the scholastic who never misses an opportunity to make a "caturbhanga", i.e. the four possible combinations of two positive and two negative possibilities…' (p. 186).

[6] Ṭhāṇa 3.239 offers also a trilemma: (1) to state the truth (*tavvayaṇa* <*tadvacana*>), (2) to state the untruth (*tadaṇṇavayaṇa* <*tadanyavacana*>), (3) to state something meaningless or negative (*no-avayaṇa* <*no-avacana*>); Ṭhāṇa 7.129 a heptalemma: (1) speech (*ālāva* <*ālāpa*>), (2)

taciturnity (*aṇālāva <an-ālāpa>*), (3) flattery (*ullāva <ullāpa>*), (4) insult (*aṇ-ullāva <an-ullāpa>*), (5) dialogue (*saṃlāva <saṃlāpa>*), (6) prattle (*palāva <pralāpa>*), (7) contradiction (*vi-ppalāva <vi-pralāpa>*).

⁷ The differentiation between 'the True (*sacca*) and the Wrong (*mosa*)' was characterised as 'primitive' by SCHUBRING (2000 § 74: 157).

⁸ I do not give the original wording in all cases. In different words, the same teaching is expressed in DVS₁ 7.1–3, which may be the oldest text concerning this subject:

> *cauṇhaṃ khalu bhāsāṇaṃ parisaṃkhāya pannavaṃ /*
> *doṇhaṃ tu viṇayaṃ sikkhe, do na bhāsejja savvaso // 1 //*
>
> *jā ya saccā avattavvā saccāmosā ya jā musā /*
> *jā ya buddhehi 'ṇāinnā, na taṃ bhāsejja pannavaṃ // 2 //*
>
> *a-sacca-mosaṃ saccaṃ ca aṇavajjam akakkasaṃ /*
> *samuppeham asaṃdiddhaṃ giraṃ bhāsejja pannavaṃ // 3 //*

'[1] Of the four kinds of speech, the thoughtful [monk] should, after consideration, learn the training in two, [but] should not use the other two ones at any occasion.

[2] That [form of speech] which is true, [but] not to be uttered, that which is halftrue, that which is [quite] untrue and which is not practised by the Jinas, the thoughtful monk should not use.

[3] [But] he should, after deliberation, use a speech not exposed to doubt, [a speech] which is neither true nor untrue and [a speech] which is true, provided that it is not to be blamed [and] rough' (SCHUBRING 1932: 101).

See Āyāra 2.4.8–11 and cf. DVS 7.11, 7.2 for examples.

⁹ Cf. HABERMAS' (1980: 419 ff.) / (1984–1987 I: 312 ff.) defence of his clear-cut distinction between claims to truth and claims to truthfulness.

¹⁰ Mookerjee, in TULSī (1985: 107): 'Truthfulness is the revelation of truth. (Gloss) Truth means the straight-forwardness [ṛjutā] in deed (physical movement), intention and word, and non-discrepant behaviour. The revelation (disclosure) of that truth is called truthfulness.' '(Note) Here "truth", as an ethical principle, is defined and explained. Umāsvāti

[*Tattvārtha-bhāṣya* 7.9], however has included revelation of ontological reality also as an aspect of truthfulness.'

[11] Ṭhāṇa 308 (4.349) gives the *nikṣepa* of *satya*: name, object, knowledge, knowledge and action according to truth. Ṭhāṇa 254 (4.102) distinguishes four types (aspects) of truth defined in terms of unequivocality or sincerity (*ujjuyayā <ṛjutā>*) of (1) gesture, (2) speech, (3) mind, (4) seamless combination of the three, with the intention not to deceive.

[12] See also Ṭhāṇa 10.89.

[13] JACOBI (1895: 160) translated *bhāva-satyā* as 'sincerity of the mind', and *yoga-satyā* as 'sincerity of acting'.

[14] Māc 5.111: *jaṇa-vada sammada ṭhavaṇā ṇāme rūve paḍucca-sacce ya sambhāvaṇa vavahāre bhāve opamma-sacce ya.*

[15] According to AṇD 605, contextual interpretation (*aṇugama*) of the meaning of a *sutta* should progress in the following sequence: 'Know that the characteristic features (of exposition) are sixfold, viz. (1) the (correct) utterance of the text (*saṃhitā*), (2) disjunction and parting (of words), (3) paraphrasing, (4) expounding of compound words, (5) anticipation of objections, and (8) establishment (of the correct meaning).'

[16] Cf. Ṭhāṇa 4.349.

[17] BHATT (1978: 14) emphasises that the *nikṣepa* in Paṇṇ 863 'has no execution in the canonical context.' The material is therefore likely to belong to 'post-canonical works from which it was taken before the canon acquired its present shape.' He lists similar passages in the canon and the commentary literature (BHATT 1978: 157).

[18] PaṇṇU 81: *jana-pada-satyaṃ nāma nānā-deśī-bhāṣā-rūpam apy avipratipattyā yad ekārtha-pratyāyana-vyavahāra-samartham iti, yathôdakārthe koṃkaṇādiṣu payaḥ piccaṃ nīram udakam ity-ādi, aduṣṭa-vivakṣā-hetutvān nānā-jana-padeṣv iṣṭārtha-pratipatti-janakatvād vyavahāra-pravṛtteḥ satyam etad iti, evaṃ śeṣeṣv api bhāvanā kāryā. PaṇṇṬ₁ 257a.1: ity-ādi "jaṇa-vaya-saccā" iti taṃ taṃ jana-padam adhikṛtyêṣṭārtha-pratipatti-janakatayā vyavahāra-hetutvāt satyā jana-pada-satyā yathā koṅkāṇādiṣu payaḥ piccam ity-ādi.*

[19] PaṇṇU 81: *sammata-satyaṃ nāma kumuda-kuvalayôtpala-tāmarasānāṃ samāne paṃkaja-saṃbhave gopālâdīnāṃ sammatam*

aravimdam eva pamkajam iti.

[20] PaṇṇU 81: *sthāpanā-satyaṃ nāma akṣara-mudrā-vinyāsâdiṣu yathā māṣako'yaṃ kārṣāpaṇo'yaṃ śatam idaṃ sahasram idam iti.*

[21] PaṇṇU 81: *nāma-satyaṃ nāma kulama-varddhayann api kula-varddhana ity ucyate dhanam avarddhamāno 'pi dhana-varddhana ity ucyate, apakṣas tu pakṣa iti.*

[22] PaṇṇU 81: *rūpa-satyaṃ nāma tad-guṇasya tathā rūpa-dhāraṇaṃ rūpa-satyam, yathā prapañcayateḥ pravrajita-rūpa-dhāraṇam iti.* PaṇṇṬ$_1$ 257a: *yathā dambhato gṛhīta-pravrajitarūpaṇ pravrajito 'yam iti.*

[23] OKUDA (1975: 127) translates *pratītya-satyā* as 'relative truth'.

[24] PaṇṇU 81: *pratītya-satyaṃ nāma yathā anāmikāyā dīrghatvaṃ hrasvatvaṃ cêti, tathā hi tasyânaṃta-pariṇāmasya dravyasya tat tat-sahakāri-kāraṇa-sannidhānena tat tad-rūpam abhivyajyata iti satyatā.* PaṇṇṬ$_2$ 257a uses the expression *pratītya-āśritya*, recourse to confirmation. PaṇṇV 11.17 gives the synonym *apekṣā*, consideration or regard.

[25] PaṇṇU 81: *vyavahāra-satyaṃ nāma dahyate giriḥ galati bhājanam anudarā kanyā alomā eḍiketi, giri-gata-tṛṇādi-dāhe loke vyavahāraḥ pravarttate, tathôdake ca galati sati, tathā saṃbhoga-jīva-prabhavôdarâbhāve ca sati, lavana-yogya-lomābhāve cêti.*

[26] PaṇṇU 81: *bhāva-satyaṃ nāma śuklā balākā, saty api paṃca-varṇa-saṃbhave.*

[27] PaṇṇU 81: *yoga-satyaṃ nāma chattra-yogāc chattrī daṇḍa-yogād daṇḍīty evam ādi.*

[28] Cf. UPADHYAYA (1987: 105–7) on Hemacandra's examples of *upacāra*, secondary meaning of a word based on similarity.

[29] PaṇṇU 81: *upamayā satyaṃ nāma samudravat taḍāgam.*

[30] The problem of the vagueness of the concept of 'heaps' is also addressed in the so-called sorites paradoxes attributed to Eubilides.

[31] Ṭhāṇa 254 (4.102) distinguishes four types (aspects) of untruth defined in terms of equivocality or insincerity (*aṇujjuyatā <anṛjukatā>*) of (1) gesture, (2) speech, (3) mind, (4) contradictory combination of the three, with the intent to deceive.

[32] According to Jain philosophy, cognitive and motivational factors

are linked. See also HYMES (1972: 283) notion of communicative competence: 'The specification of ability for use as part of competence allows for the role of non-cognitive factors, such as motivation, as partly determining competence. In speaking of competence, it is especially important not to separate cognitive from affective and volitive factors, so far as the impact of the theory on educational practice is concerned; but also with regard to speech design and explanation.'

[33] Arguably, conditions such as anger and pride can also evoke (painfully) true statements.

[34] Viy 1.9.1 (95a).

[35] Following Haribhadra (PaṇṇU 82: *ākhyāyikā asaṃbhāvyâbhi-dhānaṃ*) and Malayagiri (PaṇṇṬ₁ 258b.9: *ākhyāyikā-niḥsṛtā yat-kathāsv-asambhāvyābhidhānam*), *akkhāiya <ākhyāyika>* is usually understood as a narrative (*kathā*) of something non-existing or impossible, based on mere 'legend' or hearsay. See RATNACANDRA (1988 I: 59), and GHATAGE (1996 I: 64). This betrays the spirit of realism of Jain philosophy. Though, *kathā* may also refer to 'talk', 'discussion' or 'disputation'. Potentially negative consequences of knowledge based on mere hearsay are explained in Viy 9.31(430a–438a). Ṭhāṇa 7.80 lists seven types of gossip (*vi-kahā <vi-kathā>*).

[36] *Uvaghāya / uvagghāya <upaghāta>* is explained by Malayagiri (PaṇṇṬ 258b.10) through the example *cauras tvam* ('you are a thief'), understood here as *abhyākhyāna*—false and groundless accusation. The term *upaghāta* generally designates an act of violence, but here more specifically an insult. See also Āyāra 2.4.8 for this and similar examples of 'sinful speech'.

[37] Ṭhāṇa 6.100 lists six types of unwholesome speech. Ṭhāṇa 6.101 lists six types of false accusations, related to the context of enumeration (*pathārā <prastāra>*) in confession.

[38] See for instance NYAYAVIJAYA (1998: 343–5).

[39] On combinations of truth and untruth in behaviour (*vyavahāra*), intent (*pariṇata*), belief (*dṛṣṭi*) etc., for instance in succession, theorised in terms of character types, see Ṭhāṇa 241 (4.35–44). See CAILLAT (1965/1975: 80) on types of duplicity to be avoided.

[40] DSV 7.4–5:

eyaṃ ca aṭṭhamannaṃ vā jaṃ tu nāmei sāsayaṃ /
sa bhāsaṃ sacca-mosaṃ pi taṃ pi dhīro vivajjae // 4 //
vitahaṃ pi tahāmottiṃ jaṃ giraṃ bhāsae naro /
tamhā so puṭṭho pāveṇaṃ, kiṃ puṇa jo musaṃ vae // 5 //

[41] See also Ṭhāṇa 10.91.

[42] PaṇṇU 82: saccā-mosā dasa-vihā uppaṇṇa-mīsaga-vigata-mīsagâdi,
uddissa gāmaṃ vā nagaraṃ vā dasaṇhaṃ dāra-gāṇaṃ jaṃmaṃ
pagāsaṃtassa ūṇesu ahiesu vā evam ādi uppanna-missiyā. PaṇṇṬ₁ 258a:
"uppaṇṇa-missiyā" ity-ādi, utpannā miśritā anutpannaiḥ saha saṃkhyā-
pūraṇārthaṃ yatra sā utpanna-miśritā, evam anyatrâpi yathā yogaṃ
bhāvanīyam, tatrôtpanna-miśritā yathā kasmiṃścit grāme nagare vā ūneṣv
adhikeṣu vā dārakeṣu jāteṣu daśa dārakā asminn adya jātā ity-ādi.

[43] PaṇṇU 82: em eva maraṇa-kahaṇe vigaya-missiyā. PaṇṇṬ₁ 258b:
evam eva maraṇa-kathane vigata-miśritā.

[44] PaṇṇU 82: jammaṇassa maraṇassa ya kaya-pariṇāmassa ubhaya-
kahaṇe visaṃvādaṇe uppaṇṇa-vigata-missitā. PaṇṇṬ₁ 258b: tathā janmato
maraṇasya ca kṛta-pariṇāmasyābhidhāne visaṃvādena côtpanna-vigata-
miśritā.

[45] PaṇṇU 82: jīvaṃta-mayaga-saṃkhaṇagādi-rāsi-darisaṇe aho
mahaṃ jīva-rāsi tti bhaṇaṃtassa jīvaṃtesu saccā maesu mosa tti jīva-
missitā, ettha ceva bahusu matesu aho mahaṃto'jīva-rāsi tti bhaṇaṃtassa
maesu saccā jīvaṃtesu musā iti ajīva-missiyā, saccaṃ mayam amayaṃ vā
ubhayaṃ ṇiyameṇa avadhārayaṃtassa visaṃvāde jīvâjīva-missiyā.
PaṇṇṬ₁ 258b: [4] tathā prabhūtānāṃ jīvatāṃ stokānāṃ ca mṛtānāṃ śaṅkha-
śaṅkhanakâdīnām ekatra rāśau dṛṣṭe yadā kaścid evaṃ vadati—aho mahān
jīva-rāśir ayam iti tadā sā jīva-miśritā, satyā-mṛṣātvaṃ câsyā jīvatsu
satyatvāt mṛteṣu mṛṣātvāt, [5] tathā yadā prabhūteṣu mṛteṣu stokeṣu
jīvatsu ekatra rāśī-kṛteṣu śaṅkhādiṣv evaṃ vadati—aho mahānayaṃ mṛto
jīva-rāśir iti tadā sā ajīva-miśritā, asyā api satyā-mṛṣātvaṃ mṛteṣu satyatvāt
jīvatsu mṛṣātvāt, [6] tathā tasminn eva rāśau etāvanto 'tra jīvanta etāvanto
'tra mṛtā iti niyamenāvadhārayato visaṃvāde jīvājīva-miśritā.

[46] See LEUMANN's (1885) article on the seven early schisms
(ṇiṇhava).

[47] PaṇṇU 82: mūlakādi aṇaṃta-kāyaṃ tasseva paḍirikkaya-paṃḍuṃ-
pattehiṃ aṇṇeṇa vā vaṇassaikāeṇa missaṃ daṭṭhūṇa esa aṇaṃta-kāyôtti
bhaṇaṃtassa aṇaṃta-missiyā. PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: tathā mūlakādikam ananta-

*kāyaṃ tasyā**i**va satkaiḥ paripāṇḍu-patrair anyena vā kenacit-pratyekavanaspatinā miśram avalokya sarvo 'py eṣo 'nanta-kāyika iti vadato 'nanta-miśritā.* Cf. GHATAGE (1996 I: 227). On the *ananta-kāya*s see WILLIAMS (1983: 113–6).

[48] PaṇṇU 82: *tam eva samudayaṃ karamette sarittāṇaṃ amilāṇaṃ rāsī-kayaṃ parittam iti bhaṇaṃtassa paritta-missiyā.* PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: *tathā pratyeka-vanaspati-saṅghātam ananta-kāyikena saha rāsī-kṛtam avalokya pratyeka-vanaspatir ayaṃ sarvo 'pīti vadataḥ pratyeka-miśritā.*

[49] See MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 271, 430). Ṭhāṇa 10.66 lists ten meanings of the word *ananta*.

[50] This characterisation cannot be related to the difference between experienced or conventional time (*samaya*) and imperceptible abstract time (*addhā*) explained in Viy 11.11.1 (532b) (DELEU 1970: 178), because in this case the speech act would be neither-true-nor-false. As the authoritative work of Jain scholastic hermeneutics, the *Aṇuogaddārāiṃ* shows, Jains are careful to distinguish semantic ambiguity from philosophical perspectivism (*anekānta-vāda, syād-vāda, nikṣepa, naya* etc.), which is seen as an analytic instrument for disambiguation: 'Whereas in the fallacy of *chhal* (fraud), one word has two meanings, no word in this argument [of *syād-vāda*] is of such nature. … To declare the existence of an object from one point of view and to declare its non-existence from another point of view, is not to indulge in a *pun*, and thus to be guilty of this fallacy' (KANNOOMAL 1917: 16). Cf. C. R. JAIN (1929: 8, 16–18), GANERI (2001: 133). It should be noted that similes and analogies are considered to be media of disambiguation and not conveyors of mixed truth and untruth. Obviously, they can play both roles. On *chala*, features of 'god', 'bad debates' etc., especially in the *Nyāya-sūtra*, see MATILAL (1999, Chapters 2–3).

[51] RATNACANDRA (1988 I: 270 f., 268), GHATAGE (2001 II: 454, 461).

[52] PaṇṇU 82: *addhā kālo so divaso rattī vā, jo tam-missiyaṃ kareti, paraṃ turiyāveṃto divasato bhaṇati-uṭṭhehi rattī jāyatti, esā addhā-missiyā, tasseva divasassa rātīe vā ega-padeso addhâddhā, taṃ paḍhama-porisi-kāle taheva turiyaṃto majjhaṇhī-bhūtaṃ bhaṇatassa addhâddha-missiyā.* PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: [9] *tathā addhā—kālaḥ, sa cêha prastāvāt divaso rātrir vā parigṛhyate, sa miśrito yayā sāddhā-miśritā, yathā kaścit kañcana tvarayan divase varttamāna eva vadati—uttiṣṭha rātrir yātêti, rātrau vā varttamānāyām uttiṣṭhôdgataḥ sūrya iti,* [10] *tathā divasasya rātrer vā*

ekadeśo 'ddhâddhā sā miśritā yayā sā addhâddhā-miśritā, yathā prathama-
pauruṣyām eva varttamānāyāṃ kaścit kañcana tvarayan evaṃ vadati—
cala madhyâhnī-bhūtaṃ iti.

[53] HABERMAS (1981: 97–117) / (1984–1987 II: 62–76), and others, showed that semantic content of normative sentences can be transformed into propositional sentences while the reverse is not always possible.

[54] DVS 7.6–10:

tamhā gacchāmo, vakkhāmo, amugaṃ vā ṇe bhavissaī /
ahaṃ vā ṇaṃ karissāmi, eso vā ṇaṃ karissaī // 6 //
evamāī u jā bhāsā esa-kālammi saṅkiyā /
saṃpayāīyam aṭṭhe vā taṃ pi dhīro vivajjae // 7 //
aīyammi ya kālammī paccuppannam aṇāgae /
jamaṭṭhaṃ tu na jāṇejjā "evameyaṃ" ti no vae // 8 //
aīyammi ya kālammi paccuppannam aṇāgae /
jattha saṅkā bhave taṃ tu "evameyaṃ" ti no vae // 9 //
aīyammi ya kālammi paccuppannam aṇāgae /
nissaṅkiyaṃ bhave jaṃ tu "evameyaṃ" ti niddise // 10 //

[55] See the mixed true-false utterance 'The god of the sky' (Āyāra 2.4.1.12–13) and similar examples of mislabelling discussed in footnote 90.

[56] In symbolic logic such problems are discussed under the labels such as 'no-item thesis', 'misleading form thesis', 'truth value gap thesis', and 'new truth-value thesis' (HAACK 1974: 47 ff.). According to PRIEST (1987 / 2006) the single rationale underlying the theory of different types of truth value gaps, derived from the correspondence theory of truth, is that 'for certain sentences, a there is no Fact which makes a true, neither is there a Fact which makes ¬a true', which are to be distinguished from *dialetheia*, or true contradictions such that both statement A and its negation, ¬A, are true. In his view, the argument fails, because 'if there is no Fact which makes a true, there is a Fact which makes ¬a true, viz. the Fact that there is no Fact which makes a true' (ib., p. 54).

[57] See for instance BALBIR (1987: 9) and DUNDAS (1996: 62).

[58] PRIEST–ROUTLEY (1983: 14) cite Stoic and other authors from Greek antiquity defending this view.

[59] 'In this respect the Jains anticipate contemporary discussive logic, initiated by Jaśkowski, and they may similarly be interpreted in

terms of integration of different worlds, or positions, reflecting partial truth … Naturally such a theory risks trivialisation unless some (cogent) restrictions are imposed on the parties admitted as having obtained partial truth—restrictions of a type that might well be applied to block amalgamation leading to violations of Non-Contradiction.

Unlike the Jains, the Mādhyamikas apparently affirmed the law of Contradiction. But this does not prevent a certain unity of opposites, e.g. in the negative dialectic of Nāgārjuna, a concept, such as Being, can become indistinguishable from its opposite, Non-Being' (PRIEST–ROUTLEY 1983: 17).

[60] STCHERBATSKY (1958: 415), cited in PRIEST–ROUTLEY (1989: 16).

[61] LALWANI's (1985 IV: 133 f.) rendition of Viy 10.3.34 reads as follows: '[Gautama speaks] *Bhante!* There are twelve forms of language—address, order, prayer, question, advice, refusal, consent, enquiry, conviction, confusion, distinct and indistinct. Now, when one says, I shall take lodge, I shall lie, I shall stand, I shall sit, I shall stretch, do these forms conform to the fifth type viz. advice, and it is correct to say that they are never false?—[Mahāvīra answers] Yes Gautama! They conform to the fifth type and they are never false.'

[62] On articulated (*akkhara-suya*) evidence, composed of written and oral sources see SCHUBRING (2000: § 74).

[63] Āyāra 2.4.1.4 n., 2.4.1.7.

[64] AUSTIN (1962) distinguishes between implicit and explicit, self-verifying, performatives. An 'explicit performative sentence', such as taking a vow, 'indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action—it is not normally thought of as just saying something' (ib., pp. 6 f.)—this would be a 'descriptive fallacy' (ib., p. 3). 'None of the utterances cited is either true or false' (ib.). 'It is essential to realize that "true" and "false", like "free" and "unfree", do not stand for anything simple at all; but only for a general dimension of being a right or proper thing to say as opposed to a wrong thing, in these circumstances, to this audience, for these purposes and with these intentions. … This doctrine is quite different from much that the pragmatists have said, to the effect that the true is what works, &c. The truth or falsity of a statement depends not merely on the meanings of words but on what act you were performing in what circumstances' (ib., p. 144). The problem of

determining truth-values of performative utterances has been discussed, for example, by FAUCONNIER (1981: 182).

[65] Ṭhāṇa 6.111 lists six types of question-contexts, not all of which can be categorised as neither-true-nor-false; e.g. *vuggaha-paṭṭha* <*vyudgraha-praśna*>, questioning an opponent.

[66] On ambiguities created by the use of the future tense see also FAUCONNIER (1981: 180 f.), and others.

[67] HAACK (1974: 58 f., 73–90) criticises the 'modal fallacy' in Aristotle's argument on future contingents, but accepts it as valid if interpreted as a truth value gap theory.

[68] See further STRAWSON (1950) and the ensuing debate, on which see also HORN (1985), (2001: 362 ff.), and others.

[69] Muni Nathmal (Ācārya Mahāprajña) characterized *asatyā-mṛṣā* language as *vyavahāra-bhāṣā*, or conventional or common speech (Ṭhāṇa 4.23, Hindī commentary).

[70] PaṇṇU 82 f.: "*āmantaṇī*" *ity-ādi, he deva iti āmantaṇī, eṣā kilāpravarttaka-nivarttakatvāt satyâdi bhāṣā-traya-lakṣaṇa-viyogataś câsatyâmṛṣêti, evaṁ sva-buddhayā anyatrâpi bhāvanā kāryêti, kajje parassa pavattaṇaṁ jahā imaṁ karehitti āṇavaṇī, katthai vatthu-visesassa dehitti maggaṇaṁ jāyaṇī, aviṇṇāyassa saṁdiddhassa vā atthassa jāṇaṇatthaṁ tad-abhijutta-codaṇaṁ pucchaṇī, viṇīyassa uvaeso jahā—pāṇavahāu ṇiyattā havati dīhâuyā arogā ya emādi paṇṇavaṇī paṇṇattā vīyarāgehiṁ.* PaṇṇṬ₁ 258b: "*āmantaṇī*" *iti tatra āmantraṇī he devadatta ity-ādi, eṣā hi prāg-ukta-satyâdi-bhāṣā-traya-lakcaṇa-vikalatvān na satyā nāpi mṛṣā nāpi satyā-mṛṣā kevalaṁ vyavahāra-mātra-pravṛtti-hetur ity asatyā-mṛṣā.*

[71] PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: *abhigṛhītā prati-niyatârthâvadhāraṇaṁ, yathā idam idānīṁ karttavyam idaṁ nêti.*

[72] PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: *anabhigrahā yatra na prati-niyatârthâvadhāraṇaṁ, yathā bahukâryeṣv avasthiteṣu kaścit kañcana pṛcchati—kim idānīṁ karomi?, sa prāha—yat pratibhāsate tat kurv iti.*

[73] DELEU (1970: 241).

[74] Jambūvijaya's edition of the Ṭhāṇa 4.23 (238) contains the following commentary of Jinabhadra's *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣā* (VāBh) 376–7: *aṇahigaya jā tīsu vi saddo cciya kevalo asacca-musa.*

[75] PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: *saṃśaya-karaṇī yā vāk anekârthâbhidhāyitayā parasya saṃśayam utpādayati, yathā saindhavamānīyatām ity atra saindhava-śabdo lavaṇa-vastra-puruṣa-vājiṣu.* SCHUBRING (2000 § 74: 157 f.): 'All animals with two to four senses and beings with five senses express themselves in the neither true nor wrong way, but the latter will employ the first three modes just as well (Pannav. 260a) provided they have learnt to do so or carry along with them a higher ability.'

[76] PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: *vyākṛtā yā prakaṭârthā.*

[77] PaṇṇṬ₁ 259a: *avyākṛtā atigambhīra-śabdârthā avyaktâkṣara-prayuktā vā avibhāvitârthātvāt.*

[78] The Pāli equivalents of *pannavaṇā* and *pannatta* are *paññāpana*, *paññatta* (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 212). The word *pannatti* <*prajñapti*>, teaching, information, instruction, is frequently used in the canon, for instance at Viy 2.1.90, or Viy 16.6 (709b) where the verbs *pannaveti parūveti* <*prajñāpayati prarūpayati*> are used in to describe Mahāvīra's preaching activity. Hence, his teachings are called *pannavaṇā* <*prajñāpana*>, exposition, or *parūvaṇa* <*prarūpana*>, explanation (AGD 51, MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 210). The 'proclamations' (*Kundmachung*) or preachings of the unattached ones are also called *niggantha pāvayaṇa / pavayaṇa* <*nirgrantha pravacana*> in Viy 2.5.5 (134b), 20.8.5 (792b) and Ṭhāṇa 176a. See SCHUBRING 2000 § 37: 73).

[79] DELEU (1970: 169) writes: '*āsaissāmo* is *āśayiṣyāmaḥ*, not, as Abhay. says, *āśrayiṣyāmaḥ.*' According to the rules of speech in Āyāra 2.4.1.5 and DVS 7.8–10 one should avoid such a statement if one cannot be entirely sure.

[80] PaṇṇṬ 249b: *yathāvasthitârthâbhidhānād iyaṃ prajñāpanī*, in MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 211, cf. 346).

[81] Contrary to MĀLVAṆIYĀ's (1971: 211) view that *asatya-mṛṣā* speech 'has nothing to do with norm' it is obvious that by referring to situations that ought to be both imperatives, commissives (vows), and declaratives imply normative conditions, even if used by an enlightened being. Only assertives attempt to represent situations as they are. Searle showed that from the hearer's perspective even literal speech implies a contextual horizon to be intelligible (HABERMAS 1980: 452) / (1984–1987 I: 337). According to Paṇṇ 246b, *asatyā-mṛṣā* speech signifies not only *ohāraṇī* <*avadhāraṇī*> or determinative expressions such as 'I believe' or 'I think', but all attempts to communicate transcendental truth through

descriptive (*prajñāpanī*) speech, which is assumed to be context-free and thus by definition neither-true-nor-false (*satyā-mṛsā*). The Paṇṇ accounts for the use of certain classificatory terms and words which express universals (e.g. masculine, feminine, neuter) without clearly specifying their contextual range of meaning. Imperatives such as 'go ahead' belong to this category too. For instance, we may 'order a person of any gender and this person may or may not carry out orders. … This *ājñāpanī* (imperative) speech too could not be held as false. It should be regarded as a case of *prajñāpanī* speech' (MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971: 326).

[82] PaṇṇṬ$_1$ 249b:

> *pāṇivahāu niyattā havaṃti dīhâuyā arogā ya* /
> *emāī paṇṇattā paṇṇavaṇī vīyarāgehiṃ* //

[83] Utt 28.16 ff. lists amongst the ten sources of right insight (*samyag-darśana*) communications such as *upadeśa*, instruction, *ājñā*, command, *bīja*, seed (suggestion), as well as *abhigama*, comprehension of the sacred scriptures, and *vistāra*, complete course of study (including proofs, *pramāṇa*, and perspectives, *naya*): *nisagguvaesa-ruī, āṇā-ruī sutta-bīya-rui-meva* / *abhigama-vitthāra-ruī, kiriyā-saṃkheva-dhamma-ruī* // .

[84] Cf. MURTI (1955: 129) on transcendental language which expresses truth which is beyond language; and GANERI (2002: 271) on the non-assertible (inexpressible) in classical Jain seven-valued logic (*sapta-bhaṅgī*), which may be conceptually related to incomprehensible speech.

[85] This example could be interpreted as an early version of the 'misleading form thesis' addressed by RUSSELL (1905) and others. See HAACK (1974: 53–55). By contrast, the example 'Devadatta, give me the cow', mentioned by GLASENAPP (1915: 46), is neither-true-nor-untrue as a simple performative.

[86] Cf. SCHUBRING (2000 § 74: 158), MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 325 f.).

[87] Cf. CAILLAT (1965/1975: 80), QVARNSTRÖ M (2002: 41 n. 4).

[88] For discussion of the ethical implications of this dilemma, for instance in terms of appropriateness, see for instance GERT (1973), HARE (1981), WELLMER (1986: 26 ff.), and HABERMAS (1991: 170).

[89] GANERI (2002: 277) shows that the *sapta-bhaṅgī* is also 'not strictly truth-functional', but suggests a solution to this problem.

[90] Interestingly, some *śloka*s are similar to the last of GRICE's quality maxims: 'Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence', which invokes questions of referential truth and of the relationship between representational and expressive functions of language. The definition of the concepts of truth and falsehood, or of aspects thereof, is a notoriously difficult problem for modern science and philosophy, whose discourse is constituted by this fundamental distinction according to FOUCAULT (1981) and LUHMANN (1990). It is therefore interesting to see how the Jains tackle this issue, which is one of their foremost concerns. There is a note by LALWANI added to DVS 24.12 which identifies three types of falsehood: '(i) to deny what is, (ii) to establish what is not, and (iii) to alter the meaning'. They can be illustrated by the following examples:

(i) Jainism propagates epistemic realism. Hence, it is not surprising that there are explicit statements defending the ideal of objective truth in the scriptures, as opposed to mere appearance, opinion, or consensus. The following passage stresses the necessity for ascetics to use their faculty of judgement to discover the truth of a given phenomenon, and not to be deceived by false appearances: 'Employing their judgment, they should know something for certain and something for uncertain: (1) Having received food or not having received food, having eaten it or not having eaten it, has come or has not come, comes or does not come, will come or will nor come' (Āyāra 2.4.1.1–2). This orientation toward the world, predicated on a realistic analysis of the modalities of time, is diametrically opposed to Brāhmaṇism and Vedāntic concepts such as *māyā* etc. This is evident in the following passage, which implicitly criticises the confusion of natural phenomena with illusory imagery of divine agency: 'A monk should not say: "The god of the sky! the god of the thunderstorm! the god of lightning! the god who begins to rain! the god who ceases to rain! may rain fall or may it not fall! may the crops grow or may they not grow! may the night wane or may it not wane! may the sun rise or may it not rise! may the king conquer or may he not conquer!" They should not use such speech. ... But knowing the nature of things, he should say: "the air; the follower of Guhya; a cloud has gathered or come down; the

cloud has rained"' (Āyāra 2.4.1.12–13).

(ii)   False appearance and deception should be avoided by all
       means: 'A *muni* speaks of appearance, ignoring the truth,
       encounters a sin. Then what to speak of one who indulges
       in whole untruth [Note by LALWANI: When a woman is
       dressed as a man and if she be called a man, it is a falsehood,
       though in her dress she appears like a man …].' (DVS₂ 7.5,
       cf. Āyāra 2.4.1.3). Ways of 'establishing what is not', such
       as vague promises and speculation, are also seen
       indiscriminate or deceptive utterances, because of the
       confusion of past, present, and future. Language which may
       create doubt ('maybe or not') has to be avoided by all
       means: 'When one knows not true implication, in the context
       of the present, past, and future, says not one, "surely it's like
       this". When one is in doubt about implication, in the context
       of the present, past and future, says not one, "surely it's like
       this". "Surely it's so",—says one when one has not an iota
       of doubt of implication about the present, the past and
       future' (DVS₂ 7.8–10, cf. DVS₂ 7.6–7, Āyāra 2.4.1.5). It is
       remarkable, that early Jainism already insists on the correct
       use of temporal modalities, which must be related to the
       philosophy of transmigration, but also with the critique of
       the Brāhmaṇic sacred-word theory: 'speech exists only the
       moment when being spoken' (SCHUBRING § 68 2000:
       149). The practical value of all the cited examples is the
       same: reducing illusory appearances to their 'real' content.

(iii) There are no further maxims concerning 'changing the
       meaning' in the texts on the ways of speaking. Effectively,
       however, Jain narrative literature is based on a method of
       'changing the meaning' of Indian folklore (HERTEL 1922).
       The combined systematicity and context-sensitivity of Jain
       rules and regulations is particularly obvious in the following
       statement of the Digambara author Vasunandin's (1100 CE)
       Śrāvakâcāra 209, which propagates not only the 'abstention
       from untruth spoken out of passion or hate' but 'from truth
       too, if it provokes the destruction of a living being' (cited
       in WILLIAMS 1983: 78). This and similar examples illustrate
       how the hierarchically superior principle of *ahiṃsā*
       supersedes the maxim of truthfulness in cases of rule-

> contradiction. Cf. MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 325) on the role of
> the (situational) conditions of truthfulness in the *Pannavaṇā*.

[91] Conversely: '[1.] The monks and nuns may not use the following six forbidden forms of speech: lying, sneering, insult, coarse speaking, worldly speech, or speech renewing atoned matters. 2. There are six cases of idle talk about right conduct: of speaking rashly in relation to others, of damaging living creatures, of untruthfulness, of forbidden appropriation, of a jade, a eunuch, or a slave. Whoever uses those six kinds of idle talk, without being able to prove them fully, ranks as one who has committed the transgression himself' (KS 6.1).

[92] Cf. BROWN–LEVINSON (1978: 134 ff.). In PaṇṇṬ folio 259 B cited by MĀLVAṆIYĀ (1971: 212) the positive karmic consequences of not killing are expressed in this way; avoiding commandments of the form 'do not kill' for example by saying: 'Those who refrain from killing living beings live long and enjoy good health (in the next birth).'

[93] See also AUSTIN (1962: 4) on disguising a performative utterance as a descriptive or constative statement.

[94] Cf. GERT's (1973) 'minimal ethic'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

AṇD = *Aṇuogaddārāiṃ* [*Anuyoga-dvāra*]. T. Hanaki (English tr.): *Aṇuogaddārāiṃ (English Translation).* Prakrit Jain Institute Research Publications Series Vol. 5, Vaishali 1970.

ĀvNi = *Āvassaya-nijjutti* [*Āvaśyaka-niryukti*]. Edited with Haribhadra's *Ṭīkā.* Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay 1918.

Āyāra = *Āyāraṃga-sutta* [*Ācārāṅga-sūtra*]. (1) [English translation:] JACOBI (1884: 1–216). (2) [Original Ardhamāgadhī-Text:] Tulsī, Ācārya, Muni Nathmal (eds.): *Aṅgasuttāṇi.* Vol. 1. Second Edition. Jain Viśva Bhāratī, Lāḍnūṃ 1992: 1–248 [first edition: 1974].

DVS = Ārya Sayyambhava: *Dasa-veyāliya-sutta* [*Daśa-vaikālika-sūtra*]. (1) Ernst Leumann (ed.), Walther Schubring (tr.): *The Dasaveyāliya Sutta.* Introduction and Notes, by Walther Schubring. The Managers of the Sheth Anandji Kalianji, Ahmedabad 1932. (2) Kustur Chand Lalwani (tr.): *Ārya Sayyambhava's Daśavaikālika Sūtra.* With Translation and Notes. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi 1973. (3) Acārya Tulsī [Vācaka Pramukha], Muni Nathmal [Sampādaka aur Vivecaka] (eds.): *Dasavealiyaṃ* (Mūlapāṭha, Saṃskṛt Chāyā, Hindī Anuvāda tathā Ṭippaṇa). Jain Viśva Bhāratī, Lāḍnūṃ 1974 [first edition: 1964].

KS = Bhadrabāhu: *Kappa-sutta* [*Kalpa-sūtra*]. Walther Schubring (tr.): *Das Kalpa-sūtra. Die alte Sammlung jinistischer Mönchsvorschriften.* Einleitung, Text, Analysen, Übersetzung, Glossar. Indica 2. Hg. E. Leumann. Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig 1905 [English Translation of the revised German translation: J.A.S. Burgess: 'The Kalpa-Sūtra. An Old Collection of Disciplinary Rules for Jaina monks.' *The Indian Antiquary* 39 (1910) 257–267].

MĀc = Vaṭṭakera: *Mūlācāra.* See: OKUDA (1975).

Paṇṇ = *Paṇṇavaṇā-sutta* [*Prajñāpanā-sūtra*]. Muni Puṇyavijaya, Pt. Dalsukh Mālvaṇiyā, Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak. (eds.): *Paṇṇavaṇā (Prajñāpanā)*. Jaina-āgama-Series No. 9, Part 1–2. Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1969–1971. See also: PaṇṇṬ, PaṇṇV.

PaṇṇṬ = Malayagiri: *Prajñāpanā-ṭīkā*. (1) *Śrīmac-chyāmācārya-dṛbdhaṃ śrīman-Malayagiryācārya-vihita-vivaraṇa-yutaṃ śrī-prajñāpanôpāṅgaṃ (Pūrvārddhaṃ)*. Āgamodaya-samiti, Mehasāna 1918, 1919 [printed: Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press, Bombay]. (2) Paṇḍit Bhagavānadāsa Harṣacandra [Anuvādaka ane Saṃśodhaka] (ed.): *Vācakavara-Bhagavad-ārya-śyāmācārya-viracita Mūla tathā śrīmad-ācārya-Malayagiri-viracita ṭīkānā Anuvāda-sahita*. Bhāg I–III. Jaina Sosāyaṭī, Amadāvāda (Ahmedabad) 1935.

PaṇṇV = Haribhadra-sūri: *Prajñāpanā-vyākhyā* (*Pūrvabhāgaḥ*). Ṛṣabhadeva-kesarīmalajī [Mudrayitrī] (ed.): *Su-vihita-dhurandhara-sāhityasaudhānanya-staṃbhôpama-śrī-Haribhadra-Sūri-sūtrita-pradeśavyākhyā-saṃkalitaṃ*. Phakīrcanda Maganalāla Badāmī, Jainavijayānanda Priṇṭiṅg Press, Surat 1947.

PH = Aristotle: *Peri Hermeneias*. E.M. Edghill (tr.); *On Interpretation*. In: W.D. Ross (ed.): *The Works of Aristotle*, Volume 1: *Logic*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1928 [http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/-interpretation.html].

Sūy = *Sūyagaḍaṃga* [*Sūtrakṛtāṅga*]. English translation: JACOBI (1895: 235–435).

Ṭhāṇa = *Ṭhāṇaṅga-sutta* [*Sthānāṅga-sūtra*]. (1) Acārya Tulsī [Vācaka Pramukha], Muni Nathmal [Sampādaka Vivecaka], Acārya Mahāprajña (eds.): *Ṭhāṇaṃ (Mūl Pāṭh, Saṃskṛt Chāyā, Hindī Anuvāda tathā ṭippaṇa)*. Jaina Viśva Bhāratī, Lāḍnūṃ 1976. (2) Muni Jambūvijaya [Sampādak] (ed.): *Sthānāṅga-sūtram. Navāṅgī-ṭīkākāra-śrī-Abhayadeva-sūri-viracita-vivaraṇa-sametaṃ*. Bhāg I–III. Jaina-āgama-Granthamālā

19 (1–3). Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Muṃbaī 2002–2003. (3) Uttara Bhāratīya Pravartaka Amar Muni [Pradhāna Sampādaka], Śrīcand Surānā 'Saras' [Saha-Sampādaka] (eds.): *Sacitra Sthānāṅga Sūtra*. Bhāg I–II. Mūla Pāṭh-Hindī-Aṅgrezī Anuvāda, Vivecana evaṃ Raṅgīna Citroṃ Sahita. Padma Prakāśa, Dillī 2004.

Utt = *Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta* [*Uttarādhyayana-sūtra*]. (1) Upa-Pravartaka Amar Muni [Sampādaka], śrīcand Surānā 'Saras' [Saha-Sampādaka] (eds.); Bṛj Mohan Jain [Aṅgrezī Anuvāda] (tr.): *Sacitra Uttarādhyayana Sūtra Mūla Pāṭha, Hindī-Aṅgrezī Anuvāda, Viśeṣa ṭippaṇa tathā Bhāvapūrṇa Citroṃ Sahit*. Ātmā Jñān Pīṭh, Mānasā Maṇḍī 1992. (2) English Translation: JACOBI (1895: 1–232).

VĀBh = Jinabhadra: *Viśecāvaśyaka-bhāṣā*. Dalasukha Malavaniya (ed.): *Śrī-jinabhadra-gaṇi-kṣamā-śramaṇa-viracitaṃ Viśecāvaśyakabhāṣyam. Svopajña-vṛtti-sahitam*. Lālabhai Dalapatabhai Bhāratīya Saṃskṛti Vidyāmandira, Amadavada 1966–1968.

Viy = *Viyāha-pannatti* [*Bhagavatī-sūtra*]. (1) DELEU (1970). (2) Kustur Chand Lalwani (tr.): *Sudharma Svāmī's Bhagavatī Sūtra*. Prakrit Text with English Translation of śatakas 1–11. Vol. 1–4. Jain Bhawan, Calcutta 1973–1985.

YŚ = Hemacandra-sūri: *Yoga-śāstra*. Olle Qvarnström (tr.): *The Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra. A Twelfth Century Handbook on Śvetâmbara Jainism*. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 61, Cambridge (Massachusetts) 2002.

YT = Somadeva-sūri: *Yaśas-tilaka*. See HANDIQUI (1968).

Secondary Sources

APEL, Karl-Otto: *Transformation der Philosophie*. 2 Bände. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973 [English translation

(selection): *Towards a Transformation of Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980].

ARISTOTLE = See PH.

AUSTIN 1962 = Austin, John Langshaw: *How to Do Things with Words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1962.

BAHM 1957 = Bahm Archie J.: 'Does Seven-Fold Predication Equal Four-Cornered Negation Reversed?' *Philosophy East and West* 7,3–4 (1957) 127–130.

BALBIR 1987 = Balbir, Nalini: 'The Perfect Sūtra as Defined by the Jainas.' *Bulletin D'Études Indiennes* 3 (1987) 3–21.

BALCEROWICZ 2003 = Balcerowicz, Piotr: 'Some Remarks on the *Naya* Method', in: Piotr Balcerowicz: *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion*. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi 2003: 37–70.

BHATT 1978 = Bhatt, Bansidhar: *The Canonical Nikṣepa. Studies in Jaina Dialectics*. E. J. Brill (Indologica Berolinensa 5), Leiden 1978.

BROWN–LEVINSON 1978 = Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen: 'Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena', in: E. Goody (ed.): *Questions and Politeness. Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1978: 56–310.

BRUHN 2003 = Bruhn, Klaus: 'The Mahāvratas in Early Jainism.' *Berliner Indologische Studien* 15/16/17 (2003) 3-98.

BRUHN–HÄRTEL 1978 = Bruhn, Klaus; Herbert Härtel: 'Editors' Foreword', in: Bansidhar Bhatt: *The Canonical Nikṣepa: Studies in Jaina Dialectics*. Indologica Berolinensa 5, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1978: v–vi.

CAILLAT 1975 = Caillat, Colette: *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks*. Translated by Mr Jones,

Mr & Mrs McKenna, & Mr Whitehouse. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, L. D. Series No. 49, 1965 / 1975.

CAILLAT 1984 = Caillat, Colette: 'Prohibited Speech and *Subhāsita* in the Theravāda Tradition', *Indologica Taurinensia* 12 (1984) 61–73.

CAILLAT 1991 = Caillat, Colette: 'The Rules Concerning Speech (Bhāsā) in the Āyāranga- and Dasaveyāliya-Suttas', in: M. A. Dhaky, S. Jain (eds.): *Aspects of Jainology. Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania Felicitation Volume. Vol. 3*. P. V. Research Institute, Varanasi 1991: 1–15.

DELEU 1970 = Deleu, Jozef: *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaī). The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon.* Introduction, Critical Analysis, Commentary & Indexes. Rijksuniversiteit de Gent, Brugge 1970.

DUNDAS 1996 = Dundas, Paul: 'Somnolent Sūtras: Scriptural Commentary in Śvetāmbara Jainism.' *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24 (1996) 73–101.

DUNDAS 2007 = Dundas, Paul: 'The Non-Violence of Violence: Jain Perspectives on Warfare, Asceticism and Worship', in: J.R. Hinnells, R. King (eds.): *Religion and Violence in South Asia: Theory and Practice.* Routledge, London 2007: 41–61.

FAUCONNIER 1981 = Fauconnier, Gilles: 'Social Ritual and Relative Truth in Natural Language', in: K. Knorr-Cetina, A.V. Cicourel (eds.): *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology.* Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston 1981: 175–202.

FOUCAULT 1981 = Foucault, Michel: *L'ordre du discours.* Gallimard, Paris 1971 [English translation: 'The Order of Discourse.' Translated by Ian McLeod. In: R. Young (ed.): *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader.* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1981: 48–78].

GANERI 2001 = Ganeri, Jonardon: *Philosophy in Classical India.* Routledge, London 2001.

GANERI 2002 = Ganeri, Jonardon: 'Jaina Logic and the Philosophical Basis of Pluralism.' *History and Philosophy of Logic* 23 (2002) 267–81.

GERT 1973 = Gert, Bernard: *The Moral Rules: A New Rational Foundation for Morality.* Harper & Row, New York 1973.

GHATAGE 1996–2003 = Ghatage, A.M. (ed.): *A Comprehensive and Critical Dictionary of the Prakrit Languages with Special Reference to Jain Literature.* Vol. I–III.1–2. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune 1996–2003.

GLASENAPP 1915 = Glasenapp, Helmuth von: *Die Lehre vom Karma in der Philosophie der Jainas.* Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig 1915 [English translation: *The Doctrine of Karman in Jain Philosophy.* Translated from the original German by B. Gifford and revised by the author. Ed. H. R. Kapadia. Bombay: Bai Vijibai Jivanlal Panalal Charity Fund, 1942].

GONDA 1959 = Gonda, Jan: 'Why are Ahiṃsā and Similar Concepts often Expressed in a Negative Form?' Jan Gonda: *Four Studies in the Language of the Veda.* Disputationes Theno-Trajectinaeis. Mouton,'S-Gravenage 1959: 95–117.

GRICE 1975 = Grice, H. Paul: 'Logic and Conversation.' P. Cohen, J. L. Morgan (eds.): *Syntax and Semantics.* Vol. 3. Academic Press, London 1975: 41–58.

GUMPERZ 1964 = Gumperz, John J.: 'Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities.' *American Anthropologist* (*N.S.*) 66,6,2 (1964) 137–53.

GUNARATNE 1980 = Gunaratne, R. D.: 'Understanding Nāgārjuna's *catuṣ-koṭi.' Philosophy East & West* 30,2 (1980) 211–239.

HAACK 1974 = Haack, Susan: *Deviant Logic: Some Philosophical Ideas.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1974.

HABERMAS 1979 = Habermas, Jürgen: "What is Universal Pragmatics?" *Communication and the Evolution of Society.* Translated by Thomas McCarthy. London: Heinemann Educational, 1976 / 1979: 1-68.

HABERMAS 1980–1981 = Habermas, Jürgen: *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns.* 2 Bände. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1980–1981 [English translation: HABERMAS (1984–1987)].

HABERMAS 1983 = Habermas, Jürgen: *Moralbewußtsein und kommunikatives Handeln.* Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1983 [English translation: HABERMAS (1990)].

HABERMAS 1984–1987 = Habermas, Jürgen: *The Theory of Communicative Action.* Vol. 1–2. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Polity Press, Cambridge 1984–1987 [English translation of HABERMAS (1980–1981)].

HABERMAS 1991 = Habermas, Jürgen: *Erläuterungen zur Diskursethik.* Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1991 [English translation: *Justification & Application: Remarks on Discourse Ethics.* Translated by Ciaran P. Cronin. The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1993].

HABERMAS 1993 = Habermas, Jürgen: 'Comments on John Searle: "Meaning, Communication, and Representation".' LEPORE–VAN GULICK (1993: 17–30).

HANDIQUI 1968 = Handiqui, Krishna Kanta: *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture. Or Soma Terāpanth deva's Yaśastilaka and Aspects of Jainism and Indian Thought and Culture in the Tenth Century.* Jīvarāja Jaina Granthamālā No. 2, Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣaka Saṅgha, Sholapur 1968 [first edition: 1949].

HARE 1981 = Hare, Richard Mervyn: *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Method, and Point.* Clarendon Press, Oxford 1981.

HARNAD 1999 = Harnad, Stevan: 'Re: Are Axioms Empirical?' 19 February (1999) 1 [http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~harnad/Hypermail/Advanced.AI99/0009.html].

HERTEL 1922 = Hertel, Johannes: *On the Literature of the Shvetambaras of Gujarat.* Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig. Forschungsinstitut für Indogermanistik Indische Abteilung Nr. 1, Merkert & Petters, Leipzig 1922.

HORN 1985 = Horn, Laurence R.: 'Metalinguistic Negation and Pragmatic Ambiguity.' *Language* 61,1 (1985) 121–74.

HORN 2001 = Horn, Laurence R.: *A Natural History of Negation.* CSLI Publications, Stanford: 2001 [first edition: Chicago University Press, Chicago 1989].

HYMES 1972 = Hymes, Dell: 'On Communicative Competence', in: J. Pride, J. Holmes (eds.): *Sociolinguistics.* Penguin, Harmondsworth 1972 [first edition: 1971].

JACOBI 1884 = Jacobi, Hermann: *Jaina Sūtras I. Sacred Books of the East* Vol. 22 Oxford University Press, Oxford 1884.

JACOBI 1895 = Jacobi, Hermann: *Jaina Sūtras II. Sacred Books of the East* Vol. 45 Oxford University Press, Oxford 1895.

JAIN 1929 = Jain, Campat Rāy: *Faith, Knowledge and Conduct.* The Indian Press, Allahabad 1929.

JAYATILLEKE 1967 = Jayatilleke, K.N.: 'The Logic of Four Alternatives.' *Philosophy East & West* 17,1/4 (1967) 69–83.

JONES 1978 = Jones, Richard Hubert: 'The Nature and Function of Nāgārjuna's Arguments.' *Philosophy East and West* 28,4 (1978) 485–502.

KANNOOMAL 1917 = Kannoomal, Lala: *The Saptabhangi Naya or the Pluralist Aspects of the Jaina*

Dialectics. Atmanand Jain Pustak Pracharak Mandal, Agra 1917.

LAIDLAW 1995 = Laidlaw, James: *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, Economy and Society among the Jains.* Clarendon Press, Oxford 1995.

LALWANI 1973 = Lalwani, Kustur Chand: *Ārya Sayyambhava's Daśavaikālika Sūtra.* Translation and Notes. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi 1973.

LALWANI 1973–85 = Lalwani, Kustur Chand: *Sudharma Svāmī's Bhagavatī Sūtra.* Prakrit Text with English Translation of śatakas 1–11. Vol. 1–4. Jain Bhawan, Calcutta 1973–1985.

LUHMANN 1990 = Luhmann, Niklas: *Die Wissenschaft der Gesellschaft.* Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1990.

MAHIAS 1985 = Mahias, Marie-Claude: *Délivrance et convivialité: Le système culinaire des Jaina.* Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris 1985.

MALAMOUND 1982 = Malamoud, Charles: 'On the Rhetorics and Semantics of Puruṣārtha', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (*N.S.*) 15 (1982) 33-54.

MĀLVAṆIYĀ 1971 = Mālvaṇiyā, Dalsukh. D.: 'Introduction', in: Muni Puṇyavijaya, Pt. Dalsukh Mālvaṇiyā, Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak (ed.): *Paṇṇavaṇāsuttaṃ.* Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 9, Part 2. Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1971: 201–487.

MATILAL 1981 = Matilal, Bimal Krishna: *The Central Philosophy of Jainism (Anekānta-Vāda).* L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1981.

MATILAL 1999 = Matilal, Bimal Krishna: *The Character of Logic in India.* Eds. J. Ganeri & H. Tiwari. Oxford University Press, New Delhi 1999 [1st ed.: 1998].

MONIER-WILLIAMS 1986 = Monier-Williams, Monier: *Sanskrit-English Dictionary.* New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and

Improved. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1899 [reprinted: Marwah Publications, New Delhi 1986].

MURTI 1955 = Murti, Tirupattur Ramaseshayyar Venkatachala: *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of the Mādhyamika System.* Allen and Unwin, London 1955.

PRIEST 2006 = Priest, Graham: *In Contradiction: A Study of the Transconsistent.* Second Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006 [first edition: Martinus Nijhoff, Leiden 1987].

PRIEST–ROUTLEY 1983 = Priest, Graham; Routley, Richard. "An Impressionistic Survey of Paraconsistent Positions and Theories." *Collected Papers of the 1982 Foundations of Logic Conference*, University of Waterloo, 1983.

PRIEST–ROUTLEY 1989 = Priest, Graham; Routley, Richard. 'First Historical Introduction: A Preliminary History of Paraconsistent and Dialethic Approaches.' G. Priest, R. Routley, J. Norman (eds.): *Paraconsistent Logic: Essays on the Inconsistent.* Philosophia Verlag, München 1989: 3–75.

RAJU 1954 = Raju, P. T.: 'The Principle of Four-Cornered Negation in Indian Philosophy.' *Review of Metaphysics* 7 (1954) 694–713.

RUSSELL 1905 = Russell, Bertrand: 'On Denoting.' *Mind* 14 (1905) 479–93.

SCHROEDER 2000 = Schroeder, John: 'Nāgārjuna and the Doctrine of "Skillful Means".' *Philosophy East and West* 50,4 (2000) 559–583.

SCHUBRING 1932 = Schubring, Walther, see: DVS1.

SCHUBRING 2000 = Schubring, Walther: *The Doctrine of the Jainas: Described after the Old Sources.* Translated from the Revised German Edition by Wolfgang Beurlen. With the Three Indices Enlarged and Added by Willem Bollée and Jayandra Soni. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi 2000 [first German edition: 1935].

SEARLE 1969 = Searle, John E.: *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Cambridge University Oress, 1969.

SEYFORT RUEGG 1985 = Seyfort Ruegg, David: 'Purport, Implicature and Presupposition: Sanskrit *Abhipraya* and Tibetan *Dgons Pa/Dgons Gzi* as Hermeneutical Concepts.' *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 13,4 (1985) 309–25.

STAAL 1962 = Staal, J. Frits: 'Negation and the Law of Contradiction in Indian Thought: A Study.' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 25,1/3 (1962) 52–71.

STCHERBATSKY 1958 = Stcherbatsky, Fedor Ippolitovich: *Buddhist Logic*. 2 vols, Mouton, Gravenhage 1930-1932 / 1958.

STRAWSON 1950 = Strawson, Peter F.: 'On Referring.' *Mind* 59 (1950) 320–344.

TULSĪ 1985 = Tulsī, Ācārya: *Illumination of Jaina Tenets* (*Jaina-Siddhānta-Dīpikā*). Translated by Satakari Mookerjee. Jain Vishva Bharati, Ladnun 1985 [first edition: 1945].

WELLMER 1986 = Wellmer, Albrecht: *Ethik und Dialog: Elemente des moralischen Urteils bei Kant und in der Diskursethik*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1986.

WILLIAMS 1983 = Williams, Robert: *Jaina Yoga*. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi 1983 [first edition: 1963].

WITTGENSTEIN 1953 = Wittgenstein, Ludwig: *Philosophische Untersuchungen—Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe. Blackwell, Oxford 1953 [first edition: 1945].

Dept. of the Study of Religions
SOAS, University of LONDON
Thornhough Street, Russell Square
LONDON WC1HOXG'