

On the Relative Chronology of Dharmakīrti and Samantabhadra

Piotr Balcerowicz

© The Author(s) 2014. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

Abstract In the discussions concerning the date of Dharmakīrti, Jaina sources have never been seriously taken into account. They may, however, provide a valuable insight because Dharmakīrti both criticised and was criticised by Jaina thinkers. Two Jaina authors, Samantabhadra and Pūjyapāda Devanandin, may prove crucial in determining the actual dates of Dharmakīrti. The paper argues that Dharmakīrti directly influenced Samantabhadra in a number of ways, which sets the *terminus ante quem* for Dharmakīrti, and his traditional chronology has to be reconsidered in the light of new findings. The paper suggests new dates for all the three authors.

Keywords Dharmakīrti · Samantabhadra · Pūjyapāda Devanandin · Epistemology · Jainism · Buddhism

1.

The paper analyses certain doctrinal points in the oeuvre of a Jaina Digambara ascetic thinker Samantabhadra who seems to respond to, criticise and be directly influenced by Dharmakīrti. The thesis of Samantabhadra's historical posteriority to Dharmakīrti may have implications for the dating of both Samantabhadra and Dharmakīrti, but also for Pūjyapāda Devanandin, a Jaina grammarian and thinker.

The issues involve the idea of identity, inexpressibility, the use of the delimiting particle *eva* in the sense of exclusion or delimitation (*vyavaccheda*), and certain

The paper was originally presented to the Fifth International Dharmakīrti Conference, held between 26–30 August, 2014, in Heidelberg, in a much abridged version.

P. Balcerowicz (✉)
University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: p.balcerowicz@uw.edu.pl

other issues found in a few passages of Samantabhadra's works which reveal his knowledge of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*.

Samantabhadra—to whom such works as *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* (ĀMī),¹ *Yukty-anuśā-sana* (YA), *Svayambhū-stotra* (SvSt), *Stuti-vidyā* (StVi) and *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra* (RKŚĀ) are ascribed—is traditionally considered to live around 500–550, perhaps even earlier. Sometimes he is also thought to be contemporaneous with Mallavādin Kṣamāsramaṇa, alias Vādimukhya (before 600 CE), the author of the *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra*, the source of plethora of quotations from Dignāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, who had apparently had no knowledge of Dharmakīrti. Whether such dating can still be maintained will also be addressed in the paper. Of note is that Samantabhadra never produced a typical philosophical work which would lay down the rudiments of his philosophical system or described a portion of it in a systematic way, and instead he phrased his philosophical reflections as eulogies (*stuti*, *stotra*), philosophically quite ambiguous, in praise of religious founders, which has some important implications, such as that he never quotes his opponents, and external influences in his work are rather difficult to determine with certainty.

The working hypothesis is that Samantabhadra was acquainted with some of Dharmakīrti's ideas, primarily with his critique directed against Jainism. Additional working methodological assumption is that *x*'s criticism directed against *y*'s views is, as it was usually the case in India, framed and phrased with wording and manner indicative of the original inspiration. Another methodological strategy accepted below is that if we have reasons to think that *x* seems to respond to the ideas expressed by both *y* and *z*, out of whom *y* temporarily precedes *z*, there is no justifiable reason to assume that *x* was influenced by *z*, rather we should be ready to admit that we have only evidence to the effect that *x* was influenced by *y*, unless some additional evidence is found in favour of *z*'s impact on *x*'s thought.

2.

In his criticism of the Jaina doctrine of multiplexity of reality (*anekānta-vāda*) found in the *Svārthānumāna* Chapter of the *Pramāṇa-vārttikal-svavṛtti* (PV/PVSV 3.181–184),² Dharmakīrti³ expresses an idea that 'acts of cognitive awareness do not concern an indescribable thing,'⁴ viz. inexpressible entities are necessarily not objects of the language, but also they cannot become objects of thought. The context is a discussion that entities, which is Dharmakīrti's thesis against the Jaina's, in their natures are absolutely discrete, different from each other:

¹ Alias *Devāgama-stotra*, from the opening hemistich *devāgama-nabho-yāna-cāmarādi-vibhūṭayaḥ*.

² The chapter numbering of PV/PVSV primarily follows Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana's edition (PV₄), and the sub-section numbering of PV/PVSV 3.181–184 found in Balcerowicz (2011).

A larger portion of PV/PVSV 3.182–184 is quoted in AJP I: 23.1–27.4 and refuted in AJP I: 295.10–317.10 and AJP II: 124 ff.

³ See Balcerowicz (2011).

⁴ PVSV 3.184.22: *na hy avācyam arthaṃ buddhayaḥ samīhante*.

‘one [particular] form is invariably confined to a certain entity.’⁵ This idea is expressed by him on a few other occasions as follows:

‘For all entities with no exception have their actuality in their intrinsic nature. They do not mix their natures with another [entity], because of the undesired consequence that such [a thing] would become another [thing],’⁶

and

‘[40] All entities [being absolutely discrete] are established in their own essential natures, because they partake in the exclusion (sc. *apoha*) of [things that have] similar essential nature and [things that have] different nature. [41] Therefore, on the basis of that by virtue of which the exclusion (differentiation) of things [is accomplished] individual class notions are conceived that encompass (sc. refer to) particulars which share this [similar essential nature].’⁷

Accordingly, there is no way that two contrary properties, e.g. *P* and non-*P*, or *P* and the absence of *P*, are applicable to one and the same entity. The Jainas are reported by Dharmakīrti to argue, against the *apoha* theory, that one and the same word both affirms and negates properties either possessed or not possessed by the property-bearing substratum. In this sense, when these two aspects, i.e. assertion and negation, are considered, these imply one another (PVSV 184.10), for otherwise one could not express the absence of property *P*, inasmuch for the expression ‘absence of *P*’ to be meaningful, some kind of real absence (i.e. a positive entity) has to be accepted as its *designatum* (a thesis which Dharmakīrti rejects (PVSV 184.22: *tasmāt santy abhāveṣu śabdāḥ*—‘Therefore there are speech elements which refer to non-existent entities’), for words have to name something existent, not something non-existent. Further, the implication of Dharmakīrti’s criticism is that it is not possible to *meaningfully* negate both (1) a relation between a substratum and a property which that substratum does not possess and (2) such a property itself which is not related to the substratum. The background of such criticism is apparently the Jaina thesis that a substratum is both *P* and non-*Q*⁸, which could correspond to one of two figures (*bhaṅga*) of the method of the sevenfold modal description (*sapta-bhaṅgī, syād-vāda*), i.e. those which compound, or express jointly, *P* and non-*P* (or rather non-*Q*, to be precise), such as the third and fourth figures: (3) *syād avaktavyam* (‘*x* is, in a certain sense, inexpressible’), and (4) *syād asti nāsti* (‘*x* is, in

⁵ PVSV 3.184.2: *kvaacid apy ekam ākāraṃ pratiniyatam*.

⁶ PVSV₂ 24.24–25: *sarva eva hi bhāvāḥ svarūpa-sthitayaḥ. te na ātmānaṃ pareṇa miśrayanti. tasyāparatva-prasaṅgāt*.

⁷ PV 3.40–41:

*sarve bhāvāḥ svabhāvena sva-svabhāva-vyavasthiteḥ /
svabhāva-parabhāvābhyām yasmād vyāvṛtti-bhāgiṇaḥ // 40 //
tasmād yato yato arthānām vyāvṛttis tan-nibandhanāḥ /
jāti-bhedāḥ prakalpyante tad-viśeṣāvagāhinaḥ // 41 //*

This verse is quoted in TBV 243.18–20 with a variant *sarva-bhāvāḥ* for *sarve bhāvāḥ*.

⁸ Usually it is rendered as *P* and non-*P*, which is not quite precise; see Balcerowicz (forthcoming₁).

a certain sense, P and non- Q). As I have shown elsewhere,⁹ both figures of the *sapta-bhaṅgī* have quite a similar structure, roughly: $\sigma(x \text{ is } (P \ \& \ Q))$, the difference being in emphasis (ϵ) of the properties P and Q , which are either expressed (ϵ_1) or suppressed (ϵ_0) with respect to a given parameter (π), such as substance, place, time and condition, etc.¹⁰ What is important in the context of Dharmakīrti's criticism is precisely the fact that in both these figures of the *sapta-bhaṅgī* (as well as in the remaining three ones), two properties, for Dharmakīrti apparently contrary ones, are related to one and the same substratum. In one case (apparently Fig. 4), one of the related properties (Q), or rather the absence of it, cannot be meaningfully expressed because it is simply not related to the substratum (184.22: *tathāpi kathaṃ niśiddho yāvād asya sambandho dharmo vā nāstīti matir na bhavati*.—'Nevertheless, how can [this relation] be negated as long as its relation or property does not exist?'), and in the other case (apparently Fig. 3 of the *sapta-bhaṅgī*), the substratum with unexpressed properties is inexpressible (as the Jainas say, it is *avaktavya*), for inexpressible thing cannot possibly become an object of our cognition, and can neither be conceptualised in thought nor expressed in language (184.22: *na hy avācyam arthaṃ buddhayaḥ samīhante*.—'For acts of cognitive awareness do not concern an indescribable thing.') In Jaina view, however, the elements of language (words, sentences) may also refer to what can be called the incommunicable (PVSV 184.8: *nirupākhya*), and the example which they are reported to provide and which should be acceptable to the Buddhist nominalist are ultimate particulars, which are considered by the Buddhist to have no essential nature (*svabhāva*), and hence are genuinely inexpressible, even though can be referred to by language.

The whole discourse in which the above discussion is embedded is opened by the following verse, often quoted by the Jainas:

Since—if everything [is supposed] to have a form of both¹¹—[any] distinction between these [entities (or: between the camel and yoghurt)] would be revoked, then why does a person enjoined as follows: "Eat yoghurt!", not run towards the camel?¹²

If entities were definable in terms of their own nature as well as in the nature of other entities, argues Dharmakīrti, any distinction between them would disappear and their natures would ultimately merge. Not only could they remain absolutely inexpressible (but also impossible) and would not become objects of our thought (*na hy avācyam arthaṃ buddhayaḥ samīhante*), but also they would share ultimately the same, self-contradictory, as it were, nature, making any distinction between them an impossibility.

⁹ Balcerowicz (2014) and (forthcoming₁).

¹⁰ Thus, we have both figures: (3) *syād avaktavyam*: $P^{\pi_1 \epsilon_1} x \ \& \ \neg P^{\pi_2 \epsilon_1} x$, and (4) *syād asti nāsti*: $P^{\pi_1 \epsilon_1} x \ \& \ \neg P^{\pi_2 \epsilon_2} x$, see Balcerowicz (2014) and (forthcoming₁).

¹¹ Viz. either 'of itself and of the other' (*sva-para-rūpa*), which neatly corresponds to what the Jainas claim themselves, or 'of the universal and of the particular' (*sāmānya-viśeṣa-rūpa*), which is discussed in the preceding section on the *Sāṃkhya*. For the details, see See Balcerowicz (2011: 10–11).

¹² PV 3.182: *sarvasyōbhaya-rūpatve tad-viśeṣa-nirākṛteḥ /*
codito dadhi khādēti kim uṣṭraṃ nābhidhāvati // 182 //

Both this verse, implying the identity of entities possessed of contrary properties (P and non- P /non- Q) and therefore sharing their respective natures, as well as the conclusion that any such entity would not only be inexpressible in the absolute sense but also not amenable to thought, find their rejoinder in the following verses of Samantabhadra's *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*:

[70] Because of the contradiction, there cannot be selfsameness of nature of both [entities that are opposed in nature, which is incriminated] by the enemies of the method of the sevenfold modal description. Also when [a charge is expressly formulated by the opponents] that if [a thing is claimed to be] indescribable¹³ it is [indescribable] in the absolute sense, then even the statement that it is indescribable would not be possible.¹⁴

[71] The substance and the mode are one, insofar as there is no mutual exclusion (disassociation) of these two (sc. they are invariably related) and insofar as [these two always] undergo [their respective] particular kind of transformation due to the relationship [that holds between these two] of the potentiality bearer (sc. substance) and the potentialities (sc. modes).

[72] On the other hand, since [these two] have their particular designations and their particular numerical character (sc. substance is one, modes are many), since they have their unique natures and since there is a distinction between them in terms of their purpose etc., [therefore] there is difference between them. However, [the difference] is not in the absolute sense.¹⁵

Verse 70 seems to be Samantabhadra's direct reply to Dharmakīrti's two objections. First, Dharmakīrti's supposition that 'everything [is supposed] to have a form of both' (*sarvasyōbhaya-rūpatve*) is met with the rejoinder, in very similar wording, that it is not the case because that would lead to a contradiction (*virodhān nōbhayaikātmyam*).

Second, Dharmakīrti's criticism that inexpressible entities remain ultimately inexpressible and can never become objects of thought, i.e. 'acts of cognitive awareness do not concern indescribable thing' (PVSV 184.22: *na hy avācyam arthaṃ buddhayaḥ samīhante*), leads to Samantabhadra's statement that if some entities were truly inexpressible it would not be possible even to predicate inexpressibility of them (ĀMī 70 cd: *avācyataikānte 'py uktir nāvācyam iti yujyate*).

¹³ Here clearly: *avācyā* = *avaktavyā*, in the sense of the third (or fourth) modal proposition (*syād avaktavyam*), see ĀMī 14.

¹⁴ The verse of ĀMī 70 (*kārya-kāraṇa*) is a repetition of ĀMī 13 (*abhāva-bhāva*), and it reoccurs again and again in Samantabhadra's work: 32 (*sāmānya-viśeṣa*), 55 (*nitya-anitya*), 74 (*apekṣika-anapekṣika*), 77 (*pratyakṣa-āgama*), 82 (*antar-jñeya-bahir-jñeya*), 90 (*daiva-adaiva*), 94 (*puṇya-pāpa*), 97 (*ajñāna-jñāna*). In each case *ubhaya* (in *ubhayaikātmyam*) changes its meaning, here supplied by me in brackets.

¹⁵ ĀMī 70–72:

virodhān nōbhayaikātmyam syād-vāda-nyāya-vidviṣām |
avācyataikānte 'py uktir nāvācyam iti yujyate || 70 ||
dravya-paryāyor aikyaṃ taylor avyatirekataḥ |
pariṇāma-viśeṣāc ca śaktimac-chakti-bhāvataḥ || 71 ||
samjñā-samkhyā-viśeṣāc ca sva-lakṣaṇa-viśeṣataḥ |
prayojanādi-bhedāc ca tan-nānātvaṃ na sarvathā || 72 ||

The remaining two verses (71–72) serve to adduce justification for the theses expressed in ĀMī 70, but even these two verse have in the background the discussion of the relevant relation of the universal and the particular found the Jaina section of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* (PV/PVSV 3.181–184), which in Samantabhadra’s exposition are simply called substances and modes. The implication is that any two entities can be considered as both identical and different in accordance with the substance-expressive (*dravyārthika-naya*) and the mode-expressive (*pariyāyārthika-naya*) viewpoints, where the two viewpoints serve as parameters.¹⁶ In the context of Dharmakīrti’s possible influence, of note is the use of the term *avyatirekataḥ*, which seems to be a direct reaction to, or rather a criticism of, Dharmakīrti’s usage of the delimitative/restrictive particle *eva*, which is defined in terms of exclusion (*vyatirecaka*) in *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 4.190 (see also below).

Of significance is that, while referring to an entity which is inexpressible from a certain perspective according to the Jaina sevenfold modal description (*syād-vāda*), Samantabhadra does not use the standard and well-established Jaina term *avaktavya*, ‘inexpressible’, but prefers to use a rather unusual term *avācya* (‘indescribable’), which is precisely the same word used by Dharmakīrti in his account inexpressibility (*avaktavyatva*).

Even if one concedes, that the actual context of Dharmakīrti’s and Samantabhadra’s statements does not necessarily have to concern the *syād-vāda* as such and some of its figures, the actual contents (and the wording) of what Dharmakīrti and Samantabhadra say leads to the conclusion that they are discussing one and the same thing.

All these points of correspondence cannot be coincidental, and one has to be a rejoinder prompted by the other. It will have to be decided whether it was Dharmakīrti who is criticised by Samantabhadra or *vice versa*, for with the traditional Jaina dating of Samantabhadra it was him who preceded Dharmakīrti. But if it was not Dharmakīrti to whom Samantabhadra responds, who would that be?

Samantabhadra deals with a similar problem in his other work, *Yukty-anuśāsana*, which demonstrates that the charge of contradiction against the *syād-vāda* was something he took seriously and tried, over the years, to exonerate the theory of the apparent contradiction:

‘In the case of the [claim that] “[a thing] is indescribable”, [the conclusion] that “[a thing] is indescribable indeed” would contradict the [original] thesis because it is describable (i.e. one can at least say that “is indescribable”). If [one says] that it is intrinsically [indescribable], then it is a self-contradictory statement because it [does] describes its own nature.’¹⁷

¹⁶ See Balcerowicz (2011, § 4.2.5), (2014) and (forthcoming₁).

¹⁷ YA 29:

*avācyaṃ ity atra ca vācya-bhāvād avācyaṃ evēty ayathā-pratijñam |
sva-rūpataś cet para-rūpa-vāci sva-rūpa-vācīti vaco viruddham ||*

It is not impossible that also this verse was, albeit less directly, prompted by Dharmakīrti's criticism.

Could we however trace *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* 70–72 and *Yukty-anuśāsana* 29, which both speak of an indescribable thing, back to Dignāga? Indeed, Dignāga speaks of indescribable, inexpressible particulars which might seem to strike a familiar chord with *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* 70, which does speak of thing's indescribability (*avācyatā*), namely while explaining the grounds for two kinds of inference (*anumāna*) he explains in his *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*(-vṛtti):

‘[PSV] Now, why is inference divided into two? Because [PS] The individually marked (sc. the unique particular) is inexpressible. Due to the difference in the grasped object, [inference is different]. [PSV] For the object grasped by perception and inference is different in its own essence. If the object of perception were expressible, it could be inferred through the same word [which refers to it].¹⁸

While dealing with the ultimately existent thing, Dignāga does speak of its inexpressibility, but both the context is completely different (here, he is concerned with the nature of inference and its inapplicability to the perceptibles) and the term used, *anirdeśya*, is not the same as *avācyā*. Further, I do not find anything in Dignāga's work which could be taken as a kind of criticism directly or indirectly waged against Jaina *anekānta-vāda*, and which Samantabhadra could interpret as an a charge of contradiction implied by it. And, clearly, Samantabhadra's statement that ‘because of the contradiction, there cannot be selfsameness of nature of both [entities that are opposed in nature, which is incriminated] by the enemies of the method of the sevenfold modal description’ (*virodhān nōbha-yaikātmyaḥ syād-vāda-nyāya-vidviṣām*) is a reaction to a critique from an adversary party. We do not find anything of this sort in Dignāga's writings, whereas both the contents and wording of Dharmakīrti's critique fits the context very well. Therefore, the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* has to be dismissed as potential source of inspiration for and influence on *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* 70 and *Yukty-anuśāsana* 29. And there seems to be no other such potential source in the extant Indian philosophical literature of that time.

¹⁸ PS/PSV 2.2: *atha kasmād anumānam eva dvidhā bhidyata iti, yasmāt*

[PS] *svalakṣaṇam anirdeśyaṃ grāhya-bhedāt.*

bhinnaṃ hi pratyakṣānumānayoḥ svātmavad grāhyam. yadi ca nirdeśyaḥ pratyakṣayārthaḥ, sa tenaiḥ śabdenānumeyaḥ syāt.

Here I follow the reconstructed text (not yet published) by Horst Lasic (the project ‘Reconstruction of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* with the *Vṛtti*’, Research: Ernst Steinkellner and Horst Lasic, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia), to whom I would like to express my thanks for making the passage available. It agrees in most details with the reconstructed text in Pind (2009: 302, n. 552): *atha kasmād anumānam eva dvidhā bhidyate? yasmāt “svalakṣaṇam anirdeśyam grāhya-bhedāt”. bhinnaṃ hi pratyakṣānumānayoḥ svātmavad grāhyam. yadi ca <pratyakṣārtho nirdeśyaḥ syāt, > sa tenaiḥ śabdenānumeyaḥ syāt.* Cf. also the translation of the passage in Hayes (1988: 232).

3.

Pramāṇa-vārttika 3.182 quoted above¹⁹ is followed by another verse:

‘If [the Jaina says that] there is indeed some ultimate quality by virtue of whose singular character [the person enjoined as above] acts [with respect to the yoghurt, not with respect to the camel, then what follows is that the entity] does not have both [natures but eventually] is [only] something different: that very [ultimate quality] is yoghurt [and] that [ultimate quality] is not present in any other [thing, e.g. in the camel].’²⁰

These two verses, PV 3.182–183, jointly are meant to criticise the Jaina idea that entities allegedly share certain properties which allow one to relate them in an objective manner, by virtue of a really existing, ontologically determinable link between the entities which would bind them together, and not purely via imaginative relation, based on individual subjective observation of internally perceived similarity which is projected onto the external reality. Whereas for Dharmakīrti, all entities, being momentary, are ultimately bearers of their own unique quality only which is never shared with any other entity, for the Jainas entities have both their singular, specific qualities as well as generic qualities held by them, or some of them, in common. In other words, Dharmakīrti’s criticism is directed against the ontological underpinnings of the Jaina doctrine of multiplicity of reality (*anekānta-vāda*), according to which the entities, while undergoing constant change, which implies also the change in the qualities they possess, preserve their identity, which entails the idea that a range of qualities is common to them. This line of criticism is independently confirmed by Abhayadeva-sūri (TBV, p. 243.27 ff.), who quotes the two verses and refutes them.

It seems that it was rather *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 3.182–183, being a criticism directed against the Jainas than some other passage, e.g. PVSV 24.24–25²¹ or PV 3.40–41,²² expressing the same idea, which may have prompted the following rejoinder from Samantabhadra in his *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*:

‘This [real thing²³] is in a certain sense of the nature of everything, if we put aside [the Buddhist theory of] the exclusion of the other. If [the real thing]

¹⁹ See above, p. 4, n. 12.

²⁰ PV 3.182–183:

*sarvasyōbhaya-rūpatve tad-viśeṣa-nirākṛteḥ |
codīto dadhi khādēti kim uṣṭraṃ nābhidhāvati || 182 ||
athāsty atiśayaḥ kaścīd yena bhedenā vartate |
sa eva dadhi so 'nyatra nāstīty anubhayaṃ param || 183 ||*

²¹ See p. 2, n. 6.

²² See p. 2, n. 7.

²³ AṣS: *tattvaṃ*.

resided in something else [than itself (its own nature)], it could not be designated in any respect [at all].'²⁴

Samantabhadra does admit that entities share some kind of common characteristics but does not accept Dharmakīrti's conclusion that that would prevent any theoretical and practical distinction between the entities whose natures would become indistinguishable from each other. He denies—and that is a criticism of the *apoha* theory (which may intimate either Dignāga or Dharmakīrti as the butt)—that every entity is in a way absolutely 'self-centred', or 'it resides in itself' (*svarūpa-sthiti*), i.e. that it is ultimately incommensurable. If an entity shared no common qualities with other similar entities, it could never be expressed in language, ergo it could not even be conceptualised in thought, which is reciprocally connected to language. Samantabhadra seems to point out that the *apoha* theory is methodologically flawed because, were it true, it would necessarily prevent any description of and reference to any entity. What he does is he turns Dharmakīrti's argument around as follows. What Dharmakīrti actually asserts is the following: if any entity *x* possesses its own unique qualities as well as another entity's, *y*'s, unique qualities, then these two *x* & *y* can be treated as identical, ergo they should be expected to perform the same function, which is still another quality *S*:

$$(Px \ \& \ Py) \ \& \ (Qx \ \& \ Qy) \ \dots \ \& \ (Rx \ \& \ Ry) \ \rightarrow \ (x = y)$$

therefore, $Sx \rightarrow Sy$

What Samantabhadra does is to demonstrate that any entity has to possess also other entities' qualities because it is the way that things are nameable through the language in which one word necessarily has to potentially refer to more qualities than just one. Otherwise, the language would have to consist of as many words as there are unique entities and discrete qualities, and this would render any description and communication impossible. From the fact that more entities than one share more qualities than one follows that they share one more quality, i.e. nameability *N*, viz. more unique entities than one and more discrete qualities than one can be named with one and the same word, but it cannot follow that these entities and qualities are identical:

$$(Px \ \& \ Py) \ \& \ (Qx \ \& \ Qy) \ \dots \ \& \ (Rx \ \& \ Ry) \ \rightarrow \ (Nx \ \& \ Ny)$$

therefore, $(x \neq y)$

While commenting on *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 3.40–41, which conveys the same idea as 3.182–183, the *Pramāṇa-vārttika-svavṛtti-ṭīkā* commentator Kaṇṇakagomin does not fail to notice the exchange of criticisms between Samantabhadra and Dharmakīrti, and he quotes the above hemistich of *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* 11:

'Also, what a certain Digambara maintains, namely: "«This [real thing] is in a certain sense of the nature of everything, if we put aside [the Buddhist theory

²⁴ ĀMī 11:

*sarvātmakaṃ tad ekaṃ syād anyāpoha-vyatikrame /
anyatra samavāye na vyapadiṣyeta sarvathā //*

of] the exclusion of the other» (ĀMī 11ab). Otherwise there would be no singular character [of entities] different from this [universal character], if there were no mutual absence of things.” Also this [Digambara] has been refuted by him (sc. by Dharmakīrti), because singular character of entities cannot be established on the basis of absence. Thus, mutual absence in the case of entities which are brought about by a cause as selfsame (lit. non-different) is not possible. If they are brought about [by a cause] as different, how is mutual absence in their case possible? If they are brought about as different, how is the idea of mutual absence possible?²⁵

The structure of the argument in Karṇakagomin’s commentary might, in theory, suggest historical priority of Samantabhadra, for Karṇakagomin first quotes ĀMī 11ab and then implies that ‘that certain Digambara’, namely Samantabhadra, who must have first criticised the originator of the *apoha* theory, i.e. Dignāga, was subsequently refuted by Dharmakīrti (so ‘*py anena nirastah*). However, the sequence which Karṇakagomin suggests, namely Dignāga → Samantabhadra → Dharmakīrti, does not necessarily have to reflect a historical reality. Such historical sequence does not have to be necessarily implied by Karṇakagomin, who flourished around 800,²⁶ i.e. c. approximately two centuries after Dharmakīrti. The time which elapsed does not have to speak against the historical (in)accuracy of Karṇakagomin’s account, but it would be methodologically flawed to rely on the way the commentator dialectically structures the line of his presentation by juxtaposing the opinions of two representatives of rival schools simply for the sake of argument, and to draw from it conclusions of historical import. It could as well be argued that Samantabhadra simply features in this account as a prominent representative of Jainism, without implying any real chronology.

We should examine whether a possible inspiration for Samantabhadra’s passage could indeed, as Karṇakagomin could imply, be Dignāga’s *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, and there we do find the following passage:

‘[PS 15] Such [cognition] which has the appearance of a particular [macroscopic object] is not [produced] from that [object], because the five [kinds of sensory cognition] have consciousness as their objective substratum. Such [object (sc. the ultimate particular)] from which such [cognition] is [produced] cannot be really designated (described). ... [PS16a] And [such cognition which is] distinct from its object is not describable. [PSV] No cognition can be designated in separation from the form of its object.

²⁵ PVSVT ad PVSV 40, p. 109.3–7: *yo 'pi digambaro manyate "sarvâtmakam ekaṃ syād anyâpohavyatikrame" tasmâd bheda evânyathâ na syâd anyonyâbhâvo bhâvânâṃ yadi na bhaved iti. so 'py anena nirastah. abhâvena bhâva-bhedasya kartum âsakyatvât. nâpy abhinnânâ hetuto niṣpannânâṃ anyonyâbhâvaṃ sambhavati. bhinnâś cet niṣpannâḥ katham anyonyâbhâvaḥ sambhavati. bhinnâś cen niṣpannâḥ katham anyonyâbhâva-kalpanêty uktam.*

²⁶ See Steinkellner–Much (1995: 73, § 19).

[PS16bd] Further, the object of such [cognition] can be indicated (specified) as having the form of the universal.’²⁷

This passage does speak of a real thing which cannot be really designated (*na ... vyapadiśyate*). The context is however quite different. For Dignāga, it is the particular, or the ultimately real thing (*svalakṣaṇa*), which produces cognition but cannot be designated. For Samantabhadra, the problem of indescribability of an object, which is not a *svalakṣaṇa* but a *vastu* endowed with both particular (*viśeṣa*) and generic (*sāmānya*) features, would occur if one tried to describe it in terms of something absolutely different from the objects. Further, what Dignāga takes as ‘not describable’ (*na vācyaṃ*) is not, as in the case of Samantabhadra, the object of cognition but the cognition itself which is intensional, i.e. it requires a direct reference to its object as its actual contents. Thus the contexts and purport of Dignāga’s and Samantabhadra’s passages are quite different. In addition, what is of crucial importance to Dignāga’s project, both in the above passage and in the texts of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* and *Ālambana-parīkṣā*, is the problem of an objective substratum which should provide a basis for a production of its cognition (*ālambalālambana*). Had Samantabhadra been inspired by Dignāga and provoked to criticise him directly, he would certainly have referred to that idea and to the term *ālambalālambana* explicitly. However, these nowhere occur in Samantabhadra’s works.

4.

Whether it will be eventually decided who preceded whom, there is additional evidence that *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* 11 and Dharmakīrti’s critique of Jainism found in PV/PVSV 3.181–184 are clearly related, which is noticeable in the verbal parallelism of the two verses, especially in their first *pādas* (*ĀMī* 11a: *sarvātmaḥ tad ekaṃ syād...* and PV 3.184a: *sarvātmatve ca sarveṣāṃ*), both of which deal with the same problem, taking different perspectives though on what makes linguistic reference possible:

‘This [real thing] is in a certain sense one, of the nature of everything, if we put aside [the Buddhist theory of] the exclusion of the other. If [the real thing] resided in something else [than itself (its own nature)], it could not be designated in any respect [at all].’²⁸

²⁷ PS₃ / PSV₃ 1.15–16:

*yad-ābhāsaṃ na tat tasmāc cit-ālambāṃ hi pañcakam /
yatas tat paramārthena na tasya vyapadiśyate // 15 //*

...

*artha-rūpa-viviktaṃ ca na vācyaṃ
sarvaṃ jñānam artha-rūpa-vyatirekeṇāśakyaṃ vyapadeṣṭum.
viśayo śya ca /
sāmānya-rūpa-nirdeśyas tasmān na vyapadiśyate // 16 //*

²⁸ For the text see above n. 8.

‘If everything were of the nature of everything, then cognitions (mental images) and linguistic units would not be different [from each other]. Since these [cognitions and linguistic units] are not [non-different], the doctrine of the intermixed character of individual entities is impossible.’²⁹

These two verse do read like a conversation between both authors. Samantabhadra’s statements presuppose his knowledge of the *apoha* theory, which could be Dignāga’s version. Dharmakīrti’s criticism requires that he knew the Jaina claim that all entities share their natures, a thesis which, it should be admitted, was not unique to Samantabhadra.

5.

In reply to a hypothetical question, or rather a paradox pointed out by an imaginary Jaina interlocutor, how universal-bound words, which convey some meaning and, in the process of reference, map onto entities whose essential natures have to correspond to the ideic contents conveyed by the words, could refer to ultimate particulars which are devoid of such essential nature,³⁰ Dharmakīrti asseverates that the process of denoting particulars through words, which primarily have a universal meaning, is possible provided an object is amenable to thought and speech:

‘Of course speech elements refer necessarily to these [inexpressible particulars], because assertion (‘*x* is *P*’) and negation (‘*x* is not non-*P*’) are not possible with regard to [entities] that are not determined one way or another (sc. either through cognition or speech).’³¹

In other words, the precondition for both assertion (positive concomitance) of an entity, i.e. an ascription of a property to a particular substratum, and negation (negative concomitance), i.e. a denial of a contrary property to the substratum, is that the entity can be conceptually determined through (or to which our attention can be directed by means of) an act of cognition or speech.³² To be determinable at the same time means to possess the capacity of causal efficacy, or to execute causally efficient action (*artha-kriyā-kārin*), and these are ultimately particulars.

²⁹ PV 3.184:

*sarvātmate ca sarveṣāṃ bhinnau syātāṃ na dhī-dhvanī /
bheda-saṃhāra-vādasya tad-abhāvād asambhavaḥ // 184 //*

³⁰ PVSV 3.184.8: *bhavadu nāma bhāvānām svabhāva-bheda sāmānyam. yeṣāṃ tu nirupākhyanām svabhāva eva nāsti tatra katham svabhāva-bheda-*viṣayāḥ śabdāḥ.**—[The Jaina opponent]: “Let the universal character of entities consist in the distinction of essential natures [of entities], if you wish. But how can speech elements have as their contents essential natures [of entities] such as inexpressible [particulars] which do not have, [as you claim,] any essential nature at all?”

³¹ PVSV 3.184.9: *teṣv avaśyaṃ śabda-pravṛtṭyā bhāvyaṃ. kathamcid avyavasthāpīteṣu vidhi-
pratiśedhāyogāt.*

³² Cf. PVSVṬ ad loc., p. 343.6–8: *kathamcij jñāna-śabda-*viṣayatena*vyavasthāpīteṣu nirupākhyeṣu sarvatra vidhi-*pratiśedhe* vā yogāt* (recte: *vidhi-*pratiśedhenāyogāt**). *yadi kvacid asata ākāraṣya niṣedhe jñānābhidhāne syātāṃ, tadā niṣiddhākāra-*parihṛte* rthe vidhiḥ syāt.*

Accordingly, Dharmakīrti's passage contains three vital elements: the notion of particulars, which are by nature inexpressible and are the sole entities which ultimately real and nothing except them can execute causally efficient action, the possibility of reference either by way of assertion (*vidhi*, 'x is P') or negation (*pratiṣedha*, 'x is not non-P'), and the precondition for any meaningful reference, and thus for verbal communication and conceptualisation, is the idea that these particulars are amenable to language and thought (*vyavasthāpita*).

These three elements are found in Samantabhadra's verse, which seems to be a rejoinder to the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* and uses quite similar wording (*avyavasthāpita/ anavasthita; vidhi-pratiṣedha/vidhi-niṣedha*):

'Thus, [only an object] which is not restricted through assertion [only] or through negation [only] executes object-bound [action, i.e. is ultimately real]. If [the opponent] denies it, [our reply is]: no, because it is like in the case of an effect [which is executed] by means of both extrinsic and intrinsic conditions.'^{33,34}

What Samantabhadra means is that the ultimately existent thing is an object which is characterised by *both* assertion and denial, which is also the underlying idea of the *sapta-bhaṅgī*, directly referred to by him in the preceding verse.³⁵

The same ideas are also found in Samantabhadra's *Svayambhū-stotra*³⁶ and *Yukty-anuśāsana*,³⁷ which do not appear to have necessarily been directly prompted by Dharmakīrti.

6.

In the portion of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* section criticising the Jaina *anekānta-vāda*, Dharmakīrti asserts the nominalism thesis as against the multifacetedness claim that entities, preserving their separate identities, share similar natures:

³³ I.e. by both auxiliary causes and material cause, or by additional factors and the main cause.

³⁴ ĀM₁ 21:

*evaṃ vidhi-niṣedhābhyāṃ anavasthitam artha-kṛt /
nēti cen na yathā kāryaṃ bahir-antar-upādhibhiḥ //*

³⁵ ĀM₁ 20:

*śeṣa-bhaṅgāś ca netavyā yathōkta-naya-yogataḥ /
na ca kaścid virodho 'sti munīdra tava śāsane //*

³⁶ SvSt₁ 5.5 = SvSt₂ 25:

*vidhir niedhaś ca kathaṃcid iṣṭau vivakṣayā mukhya-guṇa-vyavasthā /
iti praṇītiḥ sumates tavēyaṃ mati-pravekaḥ stuvato 'stu nātha //*

'Affirmation and negation are accepted [in the sense of] "somehow". [Thereby] the distinction between primary and secondary [figure of the *syād-vāda*] is established. Such is the guideline of the wise (or: of the fifth Tirthaṃ-kara Sumati). That is your most excellent creed. Let the worshipper praise you.'

³⁷ YA 46:

*vidhir niṣedho 'nabhiḥpāyatā ca trir eka-śāstri-dviśa eka eva /
trayo vikalpās tava śāstra-dhāmī syāc chabda-neyāḥ sakale 'rtha-bhede //*

‘Indeed it has been established that there is no association of essential natures of entities at all, but [rather their] universal character is characterised by distinction only (sc. discrete character).’³⁸

In other words, the purport of the conclusion of a few-line argument is that there is intrinsically nothing in things which would objectively relate them, and which would then serve as an objective basis for forming class notions and for the objective existence of universals. What they all have in common is that they all are discrete (*bheda-lakṣaṇa*), i.e. numerically distinct and different from each other. This view is put forward as a criticism of the Jaina position.

This particular view seems to be directly addressed in the *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* in the following verse:

‘All [entities] are selfsame inasmuch as they have the same universal existence (i.e. all exist); [they are] discrete due to the difference in substance etc. (i.e. qualities and modes), like a unique cause [of something which is either expressed or unexpressed] in the case of intention [to accentuate its] singular character or non-singular character.’³⁹

Dharmakīrti’s notions of ‘no association of essential natures of entities’ (*na bhāvānām ... svabhāvānvayaḥ*) and ‘universal character characterised by distinction’ (*bheda-lakṣaṇam sāmānyam*) are countered by the ideas of ‘selfsameness of all entities’ (*sarvaikyam*), besides their discrete character (*prthaktva*) and ‘universal existence’ of all entities (*sat-sāmānya*).

7.

Samantabhadra is reckoned as the first Jaina thinker to introduce the delimitative/restrictive particle *eva* into the scheme of the *syād-vāda*,⁴⁰ which since his times became an integral part of the standard formulations of the respective seven figures within this theory. We do not find any evidence for the usage of the particle *eva* prior to Samantabhadra. Once it was introduced, it proved a useful semantic tool to restrict the applicability of a property (*dharma*) predicated of the real thing (*vastu*) without excluding the application of other properties to the same thing or the possession of the same property by other things.

Samantabhadra’s standard formulation of the *syād-vāda* is the following:

³⁸ PVSV 3.184.6: *sthitam etat na bhāvānām kaścit svabhāvānvayo 'sti bheda-lakṣaṇam eva tu sāmānyam*.

³⁹ ĀMī 34:

*sat-sāmānyāt tu sarvaikyam prthag dravyādi-bhedataḥ |
bhedābheda-vivakṣyām asādhāraṇa-hetuvat ||*

⁴⁰ See Balcerowicz (2009: ix–x, 2014: 36) and (forthcoming₁: § 3.4).

‘For you, [o Jina!], the [thing] is accepted to be somehow⁴¹ existent *indeed*, to be [somehow] non-existent *indeed*, similarly, it is [accepted to be somehow] both [existent and non-existent] and [to be somehow] indescribable with respect to a particular aspect (viewpoint), not in every respect.’⁴²

The verse is preceded by the same verse as *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* 70 (= ĀMī 13, 32, 55, 70, 74, 77, 90, 94, 97), which clearly states that what we have here is the formulation of the method of the sevenfold modal description. The verse contains four basic figures (*bhaṅga*) of the *syād-vāda* (*sapta-bhaṅgī*), which due to metrical reasons are expressed in an abbreviated form, the unexpressed elements given below in square brackets:

<i>Āpta-mīmāṃsā</i> 14	=	standard formulations
<i>kathaṃcit sad eva</i>	=	<i>syād asty eva</i>
[<i>kathaṃcid</i>] <i>asad eva</i>	=	<i>syān nāsty eva</i>
[<i>kathaṃcid</i>] <i>ubhayam [eva]</i>	=	<i>syād asty eva nāsty eva</i>
[<i>kathaṃcid</i>] <i>avācyam [eva]</i>	=	<i>syād avaktavyam eva</i>

Samantabhadra further explains how the *syād-vāda* figures work, pointing out that existence (or rather, being something) *indeed* (*eva*) can be predicated of a thing with respect to certain parameters and non-existence (not being something) *indeed* (*eva*) can be predicated of with respect to contrary parameters:

‘Who would not accept that, in view of the quadruplet of [the parameters such as] intrinsic nature etc. (sc. its own substance, place, time, condition⁴³) [of the thing], every [thing] is existent [as *P*] *indeed*, and in view of the contrary [parameters, viz. on the basis of the substance, place, time and condition of the other],⁴⁴ [every thing] is not existent [as *P*] *indeed*? If [the thing] were not [of such multiplex nature], it could not be established.’⁴⁵

⁴¹ The term *kathaṃcit* is a common paraphrase of the sentential functor *syāt* (‘in a certain sense’), which is more common in standard formulations of the *syād-vāda*. That *kathaṃcit* is equivalent to *syāt* is implicit in the preceding verse ĀMī 13b: *syād-vāda-nyāya-vidviṣām*.

We should remember that the *syād-vāda* of fifth–sixth centuries was still at a relatively early stage of its development, and the sentential functor *syād* was not always used.

⁴² ĀMī 14:

kathaṃcit te sad evēṣṭaṃ kathaṃcid asad eva tat |
tathōbhayam avācyam ca naya-yogān na sarvathā ||

⁴³ Cf. e.g. AṣS *ad loc.*, 132.10, 14–15; RVār 4.42, p. 254.14 ff., TṬ 5.31, p. 409.29 ff.

⁴⁴ The four basic parameters that qualify the way we predicate of a thing are meant here: substance (*dravya*), place (*kṣetra*), time (*kāla*), condition (*bhāva*), see: Balcerowicz (2014: 36) and (forthcoming₁: 3.5). Akalaṅka in AṣŚ provides the example: *sthity-utpatti-vināśātmakam sva-predeṣa-niyatam sva-sarīra-vyāpīnam tri-kāla-gocaram ātmanām...*, which correspond to *bhāva*, *kṣetra*, *dravya* and *kāla* of the soul (*ātman*). However, AṣSTV *ad loc.*, p. 343, speaks of *sva-para-rūpa* (l. 7), *saṃyoga-vibhāga* (l. 11), *sva-dravya* and *para-dravya* (l. 14), *sva-kṣetra* and *para-kṣetra* (l. 15).

⁴⁵ ĀMī 15:

sad eva sarvaṃ ko nēcchet svarūpādi-catustayāt |
asad eva viparyāsān na cen na vyavatiṣṭhate ||

But in both such basic figures, the application of the predicate is delimited by the usage of the particle *eva*. The *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* is not the only work in which Samantabhadra applies the particle *eva* to the *syād-vāda* scheme. We find it also in the *Svayambhū-stotra*:

‘[A thing] is in a certain sense *P* (*tad*) *indeed*, and, in a certain sense, it is not *P* *indeed*. Because this is the way [the thing] is comprehended in front of you, [O Jina!], it is somehow *P*. Assertion and negation do not [convey] difference and non-difference in an absolute sense, because they would [suffer from] the defect of being empty.’⁴⁶

While dealing with his favourite theme in the context of the *syād-vāda*, namely the mutual relation between the particular and the universal which allows for the ascription of seemingly contradictory properties *P* and non-*P* (or rather non-*Q*, to be precise, see above) to one and the same substratum analysed through the prism of the universal-particular relation,⁴⁷ Samantabhadra explains the rule governing the language of the *syād-vāda* in two verses, the first of which is in itself particularly cryptic both for the modern reader and for its commentator Vidyānanda, and at the same time provides a justification for his introduction of the particle *eva* into the system:

‘[41] Such a speech element which is furnished with the particle “only/indeed” (*eva*) delimits its own object from foreign objects. And [such a speech element] which expresses all modes, substances and particulars, [without differentiating its primary referent from everything else] would be tantamount to the deprivation of reference (entities designated by it), and would be like [a word which expresses] something contrary.⁴⁸ [42] [Such a speech element] which does not contain the particle “only/indeed” is equivalent to [an expression of] what has not been expressed (sc. something contrary), inasmuch as there is no exclusion [of the contrary property], even though both types of contention (straightforward assertion and straightforward denial without “indeed”) [are explicitly stated; and without the exclusion of the contrary property through the particle “only/indeed”, both contrary properties would effectively function like synonyms]. If there were [such] a relation of synonymy [between the two contrary properties, one implied by the other, if no particle “only/indeed” is employed,] none could be effectively expressed. [Consequently, if one property could not be expressed without a possibility of

⁴⁶ SvSt 9.2 = 42:

tad eva ca syān na tad eva ca syāt tathā-praṭītes tava tat kathāñcit |
nātyantam anyatvam ananyatā ca vidher niṣedhasya ca śūnya-doṣāt ||

⁴⁷ YA 40:

sāmānya-niṣṭhā vividhā viśeṣāḥ padam viśeṣāntara-pakṣapāti |
antar-viśeṣāntara-vṛttito 'nyat samāna-bhāvaṃ nayate viśeṣam ||

⁴⁸ What is ambiguous in the verse is the second hemistich, which allows for more interpretations than one. What Vidyānanda says in not a clarification of the verse as such, not to mention a word-for-word analysis, but merely a loose gloss.

the denial of its opposite,] all that [exists] would leave [no room] for the other (its opposite). [If there were no room for effective denial of the opposite property, all the exists] would loose its essence.’⁴⁹

The gist of this complex argument is that the particle *eva* serves as a delimiter of the primary meaning of a word in such a way that it merely distinguishes the primary referent of the word from everything else without denying the existence of all non-referents. In other words, for a term or phrase to be meaningful requires that it leave room for all other properties which are contrary to the primary referent without excluding their existence, i.e. without entailing that they are unrelated to the primary referent in an absolute sense. In other words, an assertion has to leave room for a negation and *vice versa*. In addition, whether we accept the validity of such reasoning or not, Samantabhadra emphasises that a predicate or a sentence without the delimiting particle *eva* would be ambiguous, to say the least; even more so, the undesired consequence which Samantabhadra points out is that the semantic difference between two contrary predicates would disappear, and when it is transposed onto the ontological plane, entities would loose their separate identities.

This clearly is a semantic background and justification which Samantabhadra succinctly provides for the idea underlying the *anekānta-vāda*, namely that *P* and non-*P* (non-*Q*) are interrelated and neither *P* or non-*P* (non-*Q*) can exist alone in an absolute sense. Each has to be delimited in the sense that its existence is directly expressed, without denying a possible existence of non-*P* (non-*Q*). Assertion of *P* in an absolute sense would, argues Samantabhadra, leave no room for a denial of non-*P* (non-*Q*), and consequently both *P* and non-*P* (non-*Q*) would turn out to stand in a relation of synonymy, ergo would become meaningless. What is important is that Samantabhadra in his works consistently understands the ascription of two seemingly contradictory properties to one and the same substratum primarily in terms of the universal-particular relation, when often the universal is exemplified as ‘substance’ (*dravya*), which extends over a number of particulars (*guṇa*, *paryāya*).

I would argue, that the inspiration for Samantabhadra to introduce the particle *eva* into the *syād-vāda* scheme was Dharmakīrti. No one before him had done it in such a consistent way as Dharmakīrti to use the particle’s delimiting/excluding force, both as emphasis and quantifier, and the way Samantabhadra uses *eva* emulates Dharmakīrti’s approach; the differences to be observed (see below) are dictated by different ontologies and requirements of different epistemologies.

Indeed, earlier grammarians discussed the meaning of *eva*, but mostly understood it in terms of *avadhāraṇa*, ‘restriction, determination, limitation, emphasis’, and not as ‘exclusion’. The *locus classicus* is *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 8.1.62: ‘When there is elision of *ca*

⁴⁹ YA 41–42:

yad eva-kārōpahitaṃ padaṃ tad asvārthataḥ svārtham avacchinatti |
paryāya-sāmānya-viśeṣa-sarvaṃ padārtha-hāniś ca virodhivat syāt || 41 ||
anukta-tulyaṃ yad aneva-kāraṃ vyāvṛty-abhāvān niyama-dvaye 'pi |
paryāya-bhāve 'nyatarāprayogas tat sarvaṃ anya-cyutam ātma-hīnam || 42 ||

Conspicuously, Ratna Lahiri (2007: 157) omits the two verses in his loose paraphrase (rather than translation) of YA.

and *aha*, there is the limitation through *eva* [and the original first verb retains its accent]’ (A 8.1.62: *cāha-lopa evēty avadhāraṇam*), and the meta-rule (*paribhāṣā*): ‘For which reason the particle *eva* is [used in a sentence], for the same reason there is the limitation regarding the other (thing)’ (rule 380: *yata eva-kāras tato ’nyatrāvadhāraṇam*)⁵⁰. Similarly, we nowhere find in Bhartṛhārī’s work derivatives of *vyavaśchid* or *avaśchid* to explain the meaning of *eva*. Significantly, Samantabhadra strays away from this tradition and does not use any derivatives of *avaśdhī* in his exegesis of the function of *eva*, and therefore this grammatical tradition could not have been the source of inspiration for him.

In the well-known passage of *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 4.190–192, Dharmakīrti lays down the rules governing the usage of the particle *eva* the way which should suit his purpose, i.e. with the *apoha* theory of exclusion in the background⁵¹:

‘The delimiting particle *eva* excludes, in the case of a property, [its] non-connection, connection with other [properties] and absolute non-connection when attached to the qualifier (predicate term), the qualificand (the subject term) or the verb [respectively]. Even when not explicitly pronounced, all these meanings are understood from the [speaker’s] intention, because every sentence has exclusion as its result. [The examples of the three kinds of usage are] the following: “Caitra is an archer [*indeed*]”, “[*Only*] Pārtha is an archer”, “A lotus is [*indeed*] blue”.⁵²

There are many differences in Dharmakīrti’s and Samantabhadra’s approach (such as the application of *eva* either to a sentence or to a term), which I will not discuss here. I will merely focus on those aspects which indicate the former’s influence on the latter.

Conspicuously, Samantabhadra does not use the verb *avaśdhī*, ‘to restrict, determine, limit, emphasise’ (*avadhāraṇa*), which would put him in line with the tradition of the grammarians (see above). Instead, he chooses to define the character of *eva* with the verb *avaśchid* (*avacchinatti*), ‘to separate, to distinguish, to determine as different, to differentiate’, which does not seem coincidental. I would argue that it is a reaction to, and an adjustment of Dharmakīrti’s more restrictive and exclusive verb *vyavaśchid* (*vyavacchinatti*), ‘to exclude, to eliminate’. The verb *avaśchid* clearly relates to and replaces Dharmakīrti’s *vy-avaśchid*, which excludes a possibility of any link between a property and its particular kind of negative relation with other properties or substrata. The verb and its derivatives, are clearly Dharmakīrti’s own innovation. This usage of *vy-*

⁵⁰ Abhyankar (1967). The rule is mentioned, with a minor variation, in DhPr 1.14, p. 75.23–24: *yata eva kāra-karaṇam tato ’nyatrāvadhāraṇam*.

⁵¹ There is a plenitude of literature on this issue, but I would draw the reader’s attention to two papers: Ganeri (1999) and Gillon (1999).

⁵² PV_{3,4} 4.190–192:

*ayogaṃ yogam aparair atyantāyogam eva ca /
vyavacchinatti dharmasya nīpāto vyatirecakaḥ // 190 //
viśeṣana-viśeṣyābhyāṃ kriyayā ca sahoditāḥ /
vivakṣāto ’prayoge ’pi sarvo ’rtho ’yaṃ¹pratīyate // 191 //
vyavaccheda-phalaṃ vākyam yataś caitro dhanur-dharaḥ /
pārtho dhanur-dhara nīlam sarojam iti vā yathā // 192 //*

[¹ PV₄: *tasyārtho ’yaṃ*.]

ava√cchid was well justified in Dharmakīrti's nominalist programme where entities were viewed as ultimately unrelated to each other. However, for Samantabhadra and the Jainas, entities *are* related with each other in various ways, and Dharmakīrti's such understanding of the particle *eva* would go counter their ontology. A minor change in the verb, i.e. the elimination of the prefix *vi*^o (*ava√cchid* to replace *vy-ava√cchid*) makes the verb compatible with the requirements of Jaina ontology. In this way, Samantabhadra rejects the strong claim of exclusion as the actual meaning of the particle *eva*, and indicates that it merely expresses the idea of distinction between properties.

An additional indication that the verses of *Yukty-anuśāsana* 41–42 are prompted by Dharmakīrti is the following. Dharmakīrti claims that even when the particle *eva* is not explicitly pronounced, all the three kinds of exclusion effected with *eva* are understood from the speaker's intention, inasmuch the particle *eva* is embedded in any sentence, for every sentence has exclusion as its result (*vivakṣāto 'prayoge 'pi sarvo 'rtho 'yaṃ pratīyate*). The premise is that even when the particle *eva* is not explicitly employed in a sentence, it is always *implied*, because such is the nature of the language which reflects the nominalist structure of the world.

It is precisely in this context that Samantabhadra's argument of *Yukty-anuśāsana* 42 should be understood: any statement of a term which does not contain the particle *eva* does not express what the speaker's intention is, but what it actually conveys may even be the contrary to the speaker's intention (*anukta-tulyaṃ yad aneva-kāraṃ*), inasmuch no exclusion (*vyāvṛtti = vyavaccheda*) of the contrary property is ever expressed through the sentence bereft of *eva*. He concludes that if one property could not be expressed without an actual possibility of the denial of its opposite (*anyatarāprayogaḥ*), i.e. if there were no intended absence of the expression of one of two contradictory properties with the explicit usage of the particle *eva*, both could effectively be implied, and consequently nothing could be expressed. The implication of this argument is that he considers it imperative to use the particle *eva* if one intends to delimit the scope of reference, for the language as such does not convey any exclusion or emphasis on its own, i.e. *eva* is never embedded in the sentence. As we can see, he presents a completely different perspective on the meaning of the particle *eva*, the role of the language and its relation to reality. Samantabhadra's expression '*nyatarāprayogaḥ*' is thus apparently a reaction to Dharmakīrti's *vivakṣāto 'prayoge 'pi*.

The pivotal passage of *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 4.190–192 in the context of the particle *eva* seems to trigger another reaction from Samantabhadra's side, namely:

'[Every] sentence accomplishes assertion and exclusion of the correlation and disjunction of the particular and the universal. From the ascertainment of non-difference should [the notion of] non-particularity [of entities] arise. From the ascertainment of exclusion arises [the notion of] particularity [of entities].'⁵³

The emphasis on *both* assertion and exclusion, and here in this sense the signature term of Dharmakīrti is used, seems to refute Dharmakīrti's claim that 'every sentence has exclusion as its result' (PV 4.192a: *vyavaccheda-phalaṃ vākyam*). Samantabhadra

⁵³ YA 61:

*viśeṣa-sāmānya-viśakta-bheda-vidhi-vyavaccheda-vidhāyi vākyam |
abheda-buddher aviśiṣṭatā syād vyāvṛtti-buddheś ca viśiṣṭatā te ||*

emphasises that what a sentence conveys is not merely an exclusion of one of three relations in which a property may stand, namely its non-connection, connection with other properties and absolute non-connection, but in addition the same sentence expresses something positive, viz. an assertion of a relation of a property.

We can thus see from the above that the views propounded by Samantabhadra on the meaning and role of delimitative/restrictive particle *eva* and the actual function of a sentence would rather be quite cryptic, outlandish and ahistoric, had they had no background in the form of Dharmakīrti's ideas.

One might argue that Samantabhadra's usage of the delimiting particle *eva* does not go back to Dharmakīrti but rather to Dignāga, in particular to his *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti* 2.5 cd, which discusses the nature of the inference for oneself (*svārthānumāna*) and the idea of the three characteristics of the inferential sign (*liṅga*), and in which *eva* is introduced as a delimiter:

‘[PS] [The inferential sign has to fulfil three conditions:] It has to be present in the inferable object and in objects similar to it, it has to be absent when these are absent. [PSV] The inferable object is the property-possessor qualified by a property. After one has observed [the property which is the inferential sign] in this [inferable object] either through perception or inference, at some later point of time the presence of the property either wholly in objects belonging to the same class [as the property-possessor] or [the presence] partially in everything becomes established. Why is it [so]? Because there is the limitation that [the inferential sign] is present *only* in objects similar to the [inferable object]; one should not claim that [the inferential sign] is *indeed* absent (i.e. absolutely absent) in objects dissimilar with the [inferable object]. Now, the following is the meaning of the restriction: absence [of inferential sign] when *only* [the inferable object] is absent, not in the case when other [objects are absent], not in the case of [objects] incompatible with [the inferable object].’⁵⁴

Indeed, there is no doubt that Dignāga uses the particle *eva* to quantify (i.e. presence in *all* objects similar to the inferable object, *tat-tulya eva sadbhāvaḥ*) and to limit the scope of objects to which a property applies. However, he himself thinks he is introducing the particle *eva* not as a novelty, but as something which had been well known from the tradition of the grammarians, and this is implied by the term *avadhāraṇāt*, i.e. the term and concept well known from grammarians' interpretations of the particle *eva*. What Dignāga actually does is an innovation, but he does not see it as such.

⁵⁴ PS/PSV 2.5 cd:

[PS] *anumeye 'ha tat-tulye sadbhāvo nāstitāṣati || 5 ||*

[PSV] *anumeyo hi dharmā-viśiṣṭo dharmī. tatra darśanaṃ pratyakṣato 'numānato vāuttara-kālaṃ dharmasya¹ sāmānya-rūpeṇa taj-jātiye ca sarvatraikadeśe¹ <vā> sadbhāvaḥ <siddhaḥ>. kuta etad iti? tat-tulya eva sadbhāva <ity> avadhāraṇāt², na tarhi vaktavyam: <atat-tulye nāstitāivēti>. etat punar niyam <ārtham>: asaty eva nāstitā, nānyatra na viruddha iti.* After reconstructed text in Pind (2009: 127, n. 8). [¹ ¹] The reconstructed text differs significantly from both Tibetan translations. However, the present reading better matches the argument. ² Perhaps better: *sadbhāvāvadhāraṇāt?*. Cf. also the translation of the passage in Hayes (1988: 239–240). On the passage and the particle *eva*, see also Katsura (1985) and (1986), and Hayes (1988: 148 ff.).

A case is quite different with Dharmakīrti who introduces his own vocabulary and typology of the meanings of *eva*. He no longer follows the traditional terminology, replacing the notion of *avadhāraṇa*, ‘restriction, limitation, emphasis’, with a new concept of *vyavaccheda*, ‘exclusion, delimitation’, even though that idea had already been implied (but not expressly articulated) in Dignāga’s exposition of the three characteristics of the inferential sign.

What we see in Samantabhadra’s exposition of the *syād-vāda* and the role of the particle *eva* is clearly not the more traditional approach which Dignāga represented but rather new ideas of Dharmakīrti. That is self-evident even in the usage of the verb *avaśchid*, the only known forerunner of which in the whole tradition is Dharmakīrti’s *vyavaśchid*.

In addition, of importance is that Dharmakīrti’s exposition of the *syād-vāda* in PV/PVSV 3.181–184 entirely lacks the particle *eva*. The examples he provides are the following: *syād dadhi nāpi sa evōṣṭraḥ yenānyo ’pi syād uṣṭraḥ* (181.2), and *syād uṣṭro dadhi syān na* (184.3). Had he been acquainted with the Jaina tradition initiated by Samantabhadra, we would expect him to verbalise the idea as follows: **syād dadhy eva nāpi sa evōṣṭraḥ yenānyo ’pi syād uṣṭraḥ*, and *syād uṣṭro dadhy eva, syān na eva*, respectively. This further strengthens my thesis that Dharmakīrti predates Samantabhadra. Conspicuously, all references to Dharmakīrti which I have managed to spot in Samantabhadra’s writings are primarily to the *Svārthānumāna* and *Parārthānumāna* chapters of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*.

8.

The date of Samantabhadra has been discussed occasionally, with most authors pointing towards around the period between fifth or sixth century, with some notable exceptions though: Rice (1889: 42): ‘he might ... be placed in the 1st or 2nd century A.D. As a matter of fact Jaina tradition assigns him apparently to about Śaka 60 or A.D. 138’, following him Mukhtār (1925: 115/1926: 115): ‘śaka saṃvat 60 (ī. saṃ. 138)’ (= 138 CE); Mukhtār (1934: 73): ‘Nāgarjuna lived about 181 A. C., and Samantabhadra too is traditionally put in the second century A.D.’; Dundas (2002: 349) the fourth century, who clearly follows Chatterjee (1978: 325): ‘the last quarter of the 4th century A.D.’; Handiqui (1968: 429, n. 3): ‘earlier than the fifth century A.D., see Pt. Yugalkisore’s Introduction (in Hindi) to *Ratna-Karaṇḍaka-śrāvākācāra*, p. 142’; Jugalkishore Mukhtār (1949) ‘prior to the fifth century’, and following them also Udayachandra Jain (1976: 35 ff.); Williams (1963: 19) around 450; Jaini (1979: 80) and Folkert (1993: 22); Wiley (2004: 183)/Wiley (2006: 183) ‘ca. 5th century’; Shah (1999: 33) places him around 550, following a paper by H.L. Jaina and M.A. Dhaky which apparently has never been published⁵⁵;

⁵⁵ ‘Prof. H.L. Jaina and Prof. M.A. Dhaky assign him to *circa* A.D. 550.’ According to Nagin Shah (1999: 33, n. 32), ‘Prof. H.L. Jaina and Prof. M.A. Dhaky, “Svāmī Samantabhadra-no Samaya” (Gujarātī paper), *Nirgrantha*, Vol. 3 Ahmedabad, 1998’. However, Vol. 3 of *Nirgrantha* was first published in 2002 as ‘Vol. III 1997–2002’, and contains no paper on Samantabhadra. Before 1999, i.e. the date of Nagin Shah’s translation of ĀMī, only two volumes of *Nirgrantha* had been published (1995, 1996), but none contains a paper on Samantabhadra. What Nagin Shah referred to was most probably a draft of a paper

Fujinaga (2006: 107), who apparently relies on antiquated views of Pathak (1930b): sixth century; Dhaky (2002: 46): 550–625; Vidyābhūṣaṇa (1909: 22, 24) and (1920: 182 ff.) ‘600 A.D.’; following him Faddegon (1935: xiv, n. 1): ‘600 A.D.’; Winternitz (1987: 459) and Upadhye (1971: *50 f.): seventh–eighth centuries⁵⁶; Pathak (1930a: 153) ‘the first half of the eighth century’. In most cases no reasons for the dating were given. In fact, the actual discussion on the dating of Samantabhadra with justifications provided is limited to two-three authors, primarily K.B. Pathak, who initiated the debate, Jugalkishore Mukhtār, who has monopolised the whole discussion about the date of Samantabhadra (actually the majority, if not *all*, of modern authors dealing with the chronology of Samantabhadra are directly or indirectly influenced by his arguments, with hardly any new evidence), and M.A. Dhaky.

The actual serious discussion on the dating started with a paper by Pathak (1930a), opening with a brilliantly ingenious remark: ‘It is easy to fix the date of Samantabhadra if we carefully study his Yuktyanuśāsana and his Āptamīmāṃsā’ (which I attempt to duly follow in the present paper). Despite the correctness of this metarule-like statement (‘careful study leads to better understanding’...), all the arguments he adduced in the sequel⁵⁷ were subsequently invalidated by Jugalkishore (Jugalkiśor) Mukhtār (1934). As a sample of methodological mistakes which Pathak commits (with which I will not deal because the inaccuracy of all of them were demonstrated by Mukhtār) I merely provide his first argument for post-Dharmakīrtian date of Samantabhadra. Pathak (1930a: 149) notes that ‘In the former work (YA—P.B.) he (= Samantabhadra—P.B.) attacks the well-known definition of perception given by Dharmakīrti in the Nyāyabindu⁵⁸, and draws the reader’s attention to the following verse:

‘Also something amenable to (lit. endowed with) indication through perception [would] not be established, because it would not be possible to make known something non-conceptual.⁵⁹ And without establishing it, there is no

Footnote 55 continued

which was subsequently published as Dhaky (2002) under precisely the same title, and was not co-authored by anyone.

⁵⁶ But compare Upadhye (1971: *30–31), who is very inconsistent: ‘In view of the fact that Pūjyapāda refers in his grammar to Samantabhadra, the latter cannot be put later than Pūjyapāda. Inscriptions from Ś. Belgol put Pūjyapāda later than Samantabhadra. ... Siddhasena, the author of the *Sanmati*, is later than Pūjyapāda and consequently later than Samantabhadra whose *Svayambhūstotra* and *Āptamīmāṃsā* have influenced the *Sanmati* of Siddhasena.’

⁵⁷ Some of which rather unconventional, such as ‘In my paper entitled the position of Kumārila in Digambara Jaina literature I have proved that the Āptamīmāṃsā of Samantabhadra and its first commentary called Aṣṭaśatī by Akalankadeva are severely criticised by Kumārila...’ (Pathak 1930a: 1530).

⁵⁸ What Pathak (1930a: 149) means is the definition: ‘Perception is free from conceptual construction and non-erroneous’ (NB 1.4: *tatra pratyakṣaṃ kalpanāpoḍham abhrāntam*).

⁵⁹ Cf. YAṬ 33, p. 66.9–17: *pratyakṣeṇa nirdeśaḥ pratyakṣa-nirdeśaḥ, pratyakṣato dṛṣṭvā nīlādīkam iti vacanam antareṅgulyā pradarśanam ity arthaḥ. sa pratyakṣa-nirdeśo śyāstīti pratyakṣa-nirdeśavat. tad apy asiddham. kuta etat, yasmād akalpakam jñāpayitum kutaścit apy aśakyam, hy yasyāt. ... tad dhi pratyakṣam akalpakam na tāvat pratyakṣato jñāpayitum śakyam tasya parāsaṃvedyatvāt. ...*

[good] sense of the definition [of perception as formulated by the Buddhists].
O Mahāvīra, there is no truth in the one who is opposed to you!⁶⁰

This is a criticism of Dharmakīrti's (?)—according to Pathak (1930a: 149)—or rather of Dignāga's definition of perception as non-conceptual by nature. It is most unlikely that Samantabhadra criticises this definition in YA 33 for at least two reasons. First, an important element of Dharmakīrti's definition, namely non-erroneousness, is entirely missing in Samantabhadra's criticism, and, secondly, it seems that what is being criticised is Dignāga's definition instead: 'Perception is free from conceptual construction, [which in turn] is disconnected from name, class, etc.,'⁶¹ which also features the idea of non-conceptual character. What Samantabhadra deals with in the section YA 29–33 is the object of cognition, primarily the object of perception (*dṛṣṭa*). It is in this context that Samantabhadra criticises the idea expressed by Dignāga in PS 1.5:

'No cognition whatsoever through a sense organ is possible of a property-possessor (i.e. a thing) endowed with many facets. What is, however, the actual domain of the sense organ is a [particular] form which is amenable to self-illuminating cognition (i.e. one becomes aware of it) and cannot be indicated (specified).'⁶²

Apparently, Samantabhadra, in his turn, takes Dignāga's passage of PS 1.5—'no cognition whatsoever ... is possible of a thing endowed with many facets'—as a criticism of *anekānta-vāda*,⁶³ and demonstrates that an object which is purely non-conceptual could not be made known to anybody, even to oneself, i.e. it would not be amenable to self-illuminating cognition.⁶⁴ What this example makes us sensitive to is that while demonstrating that Samantabhadra lived after Dharmakīrti we should always test our hypothesis against a possibility that Samantabhadra may rather have been responding to Dignāga, and we should first eliminate such a likelihood. For indeed, Samantabhadra was acquainted with Dignāga as well, as other passages of his works indicate.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ YA 33:

*pratyakṣa-nirdeśavad apy asiddham akalpakam jñāpayitum hy aśakyam |
vinā ca siddher na ca lakṣaṇārtho na tāvaka-dveṣiṇi vīra satyam ||*

⁶¹ PS_{3,4} 1.3 cd: *pratyakṣam kalpanāpoḍham nāma-jāty-ādy-ayojanā.*

⁶² PS_{3,4} 1.5:

*dharmiṇo 'neka-rūpasya nēndriyāt sarvathā gatih |
sva-saṃvedyam tu anirdeśyam rūpam indriya-gocarah || 5 ||*

⁶³ The response to it is in YA 32c: *dṛṣṭam vimīśram*—'visible thing is mixed', i.e. has many facets.

⁶⁴ Interestingly, what Vidyānanda, Samantabhadra's commentator, says in his comments (YAṬ 33, p. 66.9–11: *pratyakṣeṇa nirdeśaḥ pratyakṣa-nirdeśaḥ, pratyakṣato dṛṣṭvā nīlādikam iti vacanam antareṅgulyā pradarśanam ity arthaḥ.*) overlaps with Jinendrabuddhi's comments, who refers to a quote from an Abhidharma source (PST 1.4ab, p. 43.12–13: *nīlam vijānāti nīlam artha-svarūpeṇa jānāti, no tu nīlam iti na tan-nāmato nīlam etad iti jānāti.*)

⁶⁵ See for instance YA 56: *vikalpa-sūnyatvam avastunāś cet tasminn ameye kava khalu pramāṇam*, which presupposes Samantabhadra's acquaintance with Dignāga's idea of *vikalpa-sūnyatvam* = *kalpanāpoḍha*.

Sometimes it is voiced that Dharmakīrti refers directly to Samantabhadra. As I demonstrated in Balcerowicz (2011), there is nothing in Dharmakīrti's writings which would justify such a claim. The *syād-vāda* doctrine which Dharmakīrti is much more robust and undeveloped than what is presupposed in Samantabhadra's writings. Similarly, no reference in Kumārila's writings will justify a similar claim, albeit he does happen to briefly refer to Jaina ideas, but the contents of the reference is too vague and unspecific to enable us to pinpoint whom he actually had had in mind.

When we analyse all arguments in favour of the sixth century or earlier as the date of Samantabhadra, there are two strong cases against my hypothesis which we should examine if we want to corroborate the thesis of Samantabhadra's later date.

8.1

Since an opinion has been expressed that also Kumārila Bhaṭṭa criticised Samantabhadra's views,⁶⁶ and since Dharmakīrti and Kumārila are often regarded as contemporaries, that would exclude a post-Dharmakīrtian (ergo post-Kumārilan) date for Samantabhadra. Therefore, we should briefly consider such arguments here.

In his two papers Pathak (1930b) and (1931) argues, roughly, that since, in the *Tattva-saṅgraha*, Śāntaraksita (TSa₁ 3235–3237) quotes three verses from the *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika*, which Kamalaśīla introduces as a criticism of the idea of omniscience and apparently, with the compound *dadhi-rūpa-rasādikaṃ*, indicates the Jainas' theory of omniscience, hence one of the verses 'contains a direct attack on Samantabhadra and Akalaṅkadeva' (p. 161), and since, while quoting five verses from the *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika*, 'Śāntaraksita says that he knows the arguments of the Digambara Jaina authors [Samantabhadra and Akalaṅkadeva] alluded to by Kumārila ...', and these verses are also quoted by another Jaina Pātrakesari[n], hence Kumārila must refer to Samantabhadra's concept of omniscience. Both the logic and historical background (Kumārila of seventh century criticising Akalaṅka of eighth century) of this argument are rather fuzzy, they should be easily dismissed. Indeed, Kumārila criticises the idea of omniscience in his *Śloka-vārttika*, however there is no indication in the text itself whether this criticism is of Jaina or Buddhist concept. Granted that it were a Jaina concept, there is no slightest evidence that he had Samantabhadra in mind.

Moreover, there is no single passage in the *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika*, esp. in the section dealing with the idea of omniscience (MŚV 2.110 ff.), which could be taken as a quotation, distorted quotation or paraphrase of any verse from Samantabhadra's oeuvre. The concept of omniscience criticised by Kumārila is extremely unspecific and may relate to both Jaina and Buddhist views as well as to Naiyāyika-Vaiśeṣikas', but no slightest hint to personal views of Samantabhadra can be found in Kumārila's work.

Further, Fujinaga (2001) and Shiga (2013: 33 ff.) put forward the following argument, with different conclusions though. In his *Digambara-mata-parīkṣā*, Jitāri

⁶⁶ E.g. Pathak (1930b) and (1931), Fujinaga (2001).

(940–1000) quotes three verses⁶⁷ which go back to the *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* (ĀMī 59, 57) and the *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika* (MŚV 5.14.22). The same verses are quoted by Kaṛṇakagomin (770–830) who ‘additionally quotes ĀMī 60’.⁶⁸ On this basis alone, Fujinaga (2001: 171) concludes that ‘it is appropriate to assume that Kumārila criticized Samantabhadra’s view’ of omniscience, and therefore ‘Kumārila should be considered as belonging to a period later than that of Samantabhadra or as a younger contemporary of Samantabhadra.’ Shiga (2013: 35) points out to another possible alternative, namely that ‘it is probable that Buddhists considered Samantabhadra and Kumārila as holding the same views regarding existence... In this case, Samantabhadra and Kumārila did not criticize one another’s views; they shared them.’

A comparison of the original readings of the source texts (ĀMī 57, 59, 60, MŚV 5.14.22) with the variants of Kaṛṇakagomin and Jitāri leads to a conclusion that these four verses were first muddled up together by Kaṛṇakagomin, who attributed them to the Jainas (*tena yo 'pi digambaro manyate*) in the context of the threefold nature of reality (origin, continuation, cessation), and he was the source for Jitāri. Why should Kaṛṇakagomin mix the Samantabhadra’s and Kumārila’s verses

⁶⁷ DMP 81.10–15:

ghaṭa-mauli-suvarṇāṇāṃ¹ nāśōtpāda-sthitiṣv ayaṃ /
śoka-pramoda-mādhyasthaṃ jano yāti sahetukaṃ // 1 //

(source: ĀMī 59)

na nāśena vinā śoko nōtpādena vinā sukhaṃ /
sthityā vinā na mādhyasthaṃ tasmād vastu trayātmakam² // 2 //

(source: MŚV 5.14.22)

na sāmānyātmanōdeti na vyeti vyaktam anvayāt /
vyety uedti viśeṣeṇa³ sahaīkatrōdayādi sad // 3 //

(source: ĀMī 57)

[¹ ĀMī 59: *suvarṇārthī*. ² MŚV: *tena sāmānya-nityatā*. ² ĀMī 57: *viśeṣāt te*.]
See also Shiga (2013: 62–63).

⁶⁸ Kaṛṇakagomin, PVSVT 333.9–16:

ghaṭa-mauli-suvarṇārthī nāśōtpāda-sthitiṣv ayaṃ /
śoka-pramoda-mādhyasthaṃ jano yāti sahetukaṃ //

(source: ĀMī 59)

na nāśena vinā śoko nōtpādena vinā sukhaṃ /
sthityā vinā na mādhyasthaṃ tasmāt vastu trayātmakam¹ //

(source: MŚV 5.14.22)

payo-vrato na dadhy atti na payo 'iti dadhi-vrata' /
agorasa-vrato nōbhe tasmāt tattvaṃ trayātmakam //

(source: ĀMī 60)

na sāmānyātmanōdeti na vyeti vyaktam anvayāt /
vyety uedti viśeṣeṇa² sahaīkatrōdayādi sad // 3 //

(source: ĀMī 57)

¹ MŚV: *tena sāmānya-nityatā*. ² ĀMī 57: *viśeṣāt te*.]

remains unknown, however this is no ground to believe that Kumāriḷa could know Samantabhadra.

All these and similar⁶⁹ arguments in favour of the thesis that Samantabhadra predates Kumāriḷa rest on faulty methodology: from historical relations between different commentators of Samantabhadra, Kumāriḷa and Dharmakīrti no conclusions can be drawn as regards a relative chronology of these three authors. Accordingly, the *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika* does not seem to provide an evidence which could be useful to determine a historical relation of its author to Samantabhadra.

8.2

Suzuko Ohira (1982: 143) points out two problems which could potentially undermine my conclusion about Samantabhadra posteriority to Dharmakīrti: ‘Samantabhadra quotes maṅgalācaraṇa of Pūjyapāda in his *Āptamīmāṃsā*, and Pūjyapāda refers to Samantabhadra in the *Jainendravvyāyaraṇa* while enunciating a rule, ‘catuṣṭayaṃ samantabhadrasya’ (5.4.140) which refers to “jhayo haḥ” (5.4.136) and which does not exist in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Therefore both authors are speculated to have been the contemporaries.’ In support, she refers to Premī (1956: 44–45) in note 105. The first problem she mentions is Pūjyapāda’s reference to Samantabhadra, which I will discuss further below. The second problem concerns the *maṅgalācaraṇa* of Pūjyapāda Devanandin, alias Jinendrabuddhi, quoted by Samantabhadra. In any case, if Samantabhadra—being a post-Dharmakīrtian author, and therefore also post-Devanandin, had quoted the *maṅgalācaraṇa* of Pūjyapāda Devanandin in his *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, that would not contradict my contention about Samantabhadra being posterior to both Devanandin and Dharmakīrti. The problem would arise if it were Devanandin who quoted a *maṅgala* of a work of Samantabhadra. However, neither author, whether Premī or Ohira, specifies what *maṅgalācaraṇa* is actually meant, whether that of the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* or of the *Sarvārtha-siddhi*. The introductory *maṅgalas* of Devanandin’s both works read respectively:

*lakṣmīr ātyantikī yasya niravadyāvabhāsate /
deva-nandīta-pūjēse namas tasmai svayam-bhuve // (JV)*

and

*mokṣa-mārgasya nētaram bhettāraṃ karma-bhū-bhṛtām /
jñātāram viśva-tattvānām vande tad-guṇa-labhdaye // (SSi)*

Neither is found anywhere in the three *stutis*, nor even an indirect hint to them. Thus, at least this counter-argument against my post-Dharmakīrtian dating of Samantabhadra can safely be dismissed.

⁶⁹ Such as Pathak’s (1931) that there is an overlap between the criticism of Kumāriḷa’s objections against omniscience and the response contained in Akalaṅka’s *Aṣṭa-śatī*, Vidyānanda Pātrakesarīsvāmin’s *Aṣṭa-sahasī* and the *Tattva-saṅgraha*, and therefore Samantabhadra, commented upon by Akalaṅka and Vidyānanda, must be earlier than Kumāriḷa criticised by them.

8.3

The second, and more serious problem concerns the final *sūtra* of Pūjyapāda Devanandin's grammar *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* (JV 5.4.168 = JV₂ 5.4.140), which reads: *catuṣṭayaṃ samantabhadrasya*. This is universally treated as a direct reference to Samantabhadra, and I see no compelling reason to dispute it. Pathak (1930a: 153–154) argues—in fact rather convincingly, and the arguments against his position presented by Jugalkiśor Mukhtār (1934: 86–88) are not quite convincing ('it is a mere conjecture')—that the *sūtra* is a later interpolation. However, Mukhtār (1934: 87) also seems quite justified in concluding that 'In the face of this *sūtra* one cannot put Samantabhadra later than Pūjyapāda.' Clearly, in view of this reference to Samantabhadra one should however accept that Pūjyapāda Devanandin did know a certain Samantabhadra. But here a few related problems crop up which all should be properly solved.

9.

The first of these problems is the actual dating of the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*, which entails the question whether the author of this work is the same as the author of the *Sarvārtha-siddhi*.

The second question is whether we have one Samantabhadra as the author of the three separate groups of texts, viz. (1) the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra*, the work on the proper conduct of lay Jinas, (2) the three epistemological eulogies (*stuti*, *stotra*), i.e. *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana*, *Svayambhū-stotra*, and (3) the *Stuti-vidyā*, the work on poetics.

The third is the actual date of Dharmakīrti, which can help us decide on the first and second problems, but which should also be determined by the proper solution of these two questions. Clearly it is a case of methodological vicious circle under present circumstances, because none of these questions can at present be solved satisfactorily.

9.1

As far as the authorship of the *Stuti-vidyā* (StVi) is concerned, I would maintain, relying on intratextual criteria, that the text is not a work of Samantabhadra, i.e. it was neither composed by the author of the three epistemological eulogies nor by the author of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* (in case the expert in the Jaina lay conduct is different from the epistemologist–eulogist), though we cannot absolutely exclude such possibility. If that work had been penned by someone named Samantabhadra, this has to be another Samantabhadra.

Even a cursory look at this *Science of Eulogies* reveals a high mastery of the author, which is not necessarily matched by the quality of the three epistemological *stutis*, and certainly not by the verses of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra*. This is not to say that the three epistemological *stutis* or the work on the lay conduct are of

mediocre sub-standard. On the contrary, they are composed with considerable expertise, but they do not reflect the plethora of meters, poetic devices etc. which are found in the *Stuti-vidyā*. There are two conspicuous features of the *Stuti-vidyā*. First, it abounds in particular rhymed or semi-rhymed meters, in fact they appear to be in the majority, and it seems the author was extremely fond of them,⁷⁰ but none of these is ever found in the four other works ascribed to Samantabhadra, which would be rather surprising if we considered that the author of these works were one and the same person. In fact, I have spotted no single case of a rhymed verse in the three epistemological eulogies or in the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*. Second, the author of the *Stuti-vidyā* displays his exceptional skill at alliteration and similar poetic devices.⁷¹ Were Samantabhadra, the author of the three epistemological eulogies and the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra* the same person who composed the work on poetics, he would have with certainty displayed this remarkable poetic proficiency at least on one occasion.

In the *īkā* commentary, the author of the *Stuti-vidyā* is called ‘the crest jewel of philosophers’ (*tārkika-cūḍā-māṇi-śrīmat-samantabhadrācārya*; StVi, p. 2.6–7), which could relate the author of this work to the three epistemological *stutis*. On the other hand, the two references to ‘Samantabhadra’ in the *Alaṅkāra-cintā-maṇi* of Ajitasena (15th c.)⁷² are clearly to Samantabhadra the poet as the author of this work.⁷³ But the question is whether he is the same as the author of the three epistemological eulogies is open, though it is unlikely. Certainly, when Ajitasena wrote his commentary, the tradition unanimously considered all Samantabhadras to be one and the same author of all the works, i.e. *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana*, *Svayambhū-stotra*, *Stuti-vidyā* and *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*. Hence this testimony is of little value.

⁷⁰ See, for instance the final portions of the *pādas* b/d of just a few samples of the opening verses: ... *gasām jaye / ... prasādhaye* // (1); ... *gunārṇavam / ...kṣaṇācchivam* // (2); ... *nvarānatāḥ / ...natanvata* // (3); ... *bhāsitaḥ / ...bhāṣitaḥ* // (5); ... *bhisvanaiḥ / ...bhirjanaiḥ* // (6); ... *svavān / ...bhavān* // (7); ... *vartate / ...vasya te* // (8); *nute paraḥ / ...rciteśvaraḥ* // (9); etc.

⁷¹ To provide some samples:

*na me mānamamāmena mānamānamamānamā-
manāmo nu nu monāmanamanoma manomana* // 94 //
*mānonānāmanūnānāṇi munīnāṇi mānināminam /
manūnāmanunaumīmaṇi nemināmānamānaman* // 97 //
*tamottu mamatātīta mamottamamatāmṛta /
tatāmītamete tātamatātītamṛtemita* // 100 //

⁷² See ACM, ‘General Editorial’, p. 2.

⁷³ ACM 2.128 (p. 68):

*śrīmat-samantabhadrārya-jinasenādi-bhāṣitam /
lakṣyamātraṇi likhāmi sva-nāma-sūcita-lakṣaṇam* //

ACM 5.156 (p. 169):

*śrīmat-samantabhadrākhye mahā-vāḍini cāgate /
kuvāḍino ’likhan bhūmim aṅguṣṭhāir ānatānanāḥ* //

9.2

Accordingly, there is nothing to prevent us from considering Dharmakīrti the *terminus post quem* for Samantabhadra who was the author of the three epistemological eulogies.

There is little more difficulty with the *terminus ante quem* for him. In fact, the personage of Samantabhadra is shrouded in medieval myths, which in their turn influenced marginal glosses on manuscripts⁷⁴ which in turn provided inspiration to a range of contemporary researchers and Jainas, including Mukhtār,⁷⁵ to devise detailed biographies of Samantabhadra. All of such evidence provides no reliable basis and can rather be forthrightly rejected. Similarly unreliable are the Jaina *paṭṭāvalis* which present ascetic lineages.⁷⁶

With certainty, a solid *terminus ante quem* for Samantabhadra as the author of the *stutis* is the time of Akalaṅka (720–780) who wrote *Aṣṭa-śatī* (AṣṢ), a commentary on the *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*.

But is there any additional, external evidence of Samantabhadra? The earliest epigraphic evidence for Samantabhadra comes from Karnāṭaka, in particular from Śravaṇabelagoḷa, dates back to 12th century. The inscriptions which bear the name of Samantabhadra, include Inscriptions No. 40 (dated: 1163), 47 (dated: 1115), 54⁷⁷/67⁷⁸ (dated: 1128), 105⁷⁹/254⁸⁰ (dated: 1398), 108⁸¹/258⁸² (dated: 1433) in Śravaṇabelagoḷa,⁸³ and from elsewhere, e.g. Inscription No. 83 (dated 1117) in Chāmarājnagar Taluq,⁸⁴ Inscriptions No. 100, (dated 1145) and 103 (dated 1120) in Nāgamaṅgala Taluq,⁸⁵ Inscription No. 76 (dated 1145) in Yallādahalli.⁸⁶ It seems that suddenly in the 12th century, during the Hoysala reign, the references to Samantabhadra, and these are usually references to the name alone, with no reference to the kind of the literary genre which he practised, began to proliferate. Due to such late date, however, all the epigraphic evidence is of hardly any use to establish the date of Samantabhadra.

⁷⁴ See Ghoshal (2002: 13–15).

⁷⁵ See e.g. his Introduction ‘Samantabhadra-kā saṃkṣipta paricay’ to SvSt₁, pp. 83–106, or his ‘Prastāvanā’ to RKŚĀ₁, pp. 1–88.

⁷⁶ See Ghoshal (2002: 15 ff.).

⁷⁷ Rice (1889).

⁷⁸ Narasimhachar (1923).

⁷⁹ Rice (1889).

⁸⁰ Narasimhachar (1923).

⁸¹ Rice (1889).

⁸² Narasimhachar (1923).

⁸³ For epigraphic evidence see Rice (1889) and Narasimhachar (1923). For an account, see Rice (1889: 41 ff.), Narasimhachar (1923: 82–88), Ghoshal (2002: 15–18).

⁸⁴ Rice (1898).

⁸⁵ Rice (1898: 245).

⁸⁶ Rice (1898: 229).

In addition, most epigraphic evidence for Samantabhadra is quite enigmatic. Interestingly, the legends found in the inscriptions associate Samantabhadra primarily with some elements of the conduct,⁸⁷ which incidentally happens to be the subject matter of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*, much less so with his philosophical interests. These legends include the story of his planned but never accomplished *sallekhanā* ('terminal fast') and dietary regulations (prompted by his morbid appetite and a *bhāsmaka* disease, Inscription No. 54/67), a story of a proper way to carry out the *pūjā* and donation of food (*dāna*) as a criticism of the erection of thousands of *liṅgas* by the Kāñchi king Śivakoṭi, etc. In one of them, he is called 'the upholder of the community',⁸⁸ another one speaks of the 'light of the jewel (*ratna*) of Samantabhadra's words',⁸⁹ which may perhaps be a concealed reference to the title of the work *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*, 'The Conduct for lay people in the form of a Basket of Jewels'. These stories read like justifications for assorted topics of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra* and like an explanation why Samantabhadra undertook to compose the work. In addition, as Rice (1889: 42) notices, 'Samantabhadra, with Kaviparimēṣṭi and Pūjyapāda, always in this order, is invoked at the beginning of all the principal Jaina works in Haḷe Kannaḍa.' On the other hand, some inscriptions, primarily outside of Śravaṇabelagoḷa, mention only Samantabhadra and Akalaṅka together, with reference to no other Jaina teacher, e.g. Inscription No. 76 (dated 1145) in Yallādahaḷḷi,⁹⁰ Inscriptions No. 100 (dated 1145)⁹¹ and No. 103 (dated 1120)⁹² in Nāgamaṅgala Taluq. At the same time, two inscriptions of Śravaṇabelagoḷa relate Samantabhadra to the *syād-vāda* (No. 105/254) and call him 'the author of *Jina-śāsana*' (*praṇetā jina-śāsanasya*; No. 108/258). There is no single expression which would speak of Samantabhadra as a versatile teacher, both an expert in proper conduct for lay people and in logic or in *syād-vāda*.

These two-track descriptions could hypothetically be interpreted as preserving a vague memory of two personages of Samantabhadra, a distant possibility which I will discuss further on. In addition, the references to Samantabhadra as primarily connected with the proper conduct could *perhaps* be interpreted as a fossilised memory that one of two Samantabhadras was an author of a work of Jaina lay conduct (*śravākācāra*) and lived before Pūjyapāda Devanandin.

Non-epigraphic references to Samantabhadra in early Jaina literature are very few, all of them date back to the eighth–ninth centuries, and are found:

- in the *Ādi-purāṇa*⁹³ of Jinasena (c. 770–850), the preceptor of Amoghavarṣa (814–878),

⁸⁷ For an overview of these legends, see Rice (1889: 42 ff., 61 ff.).

⁸⁸ *samantabhadra-gaṇa-bhṛd*, 54 / 67 (Rice 1889/Narasimhaḥar 1923).

⁸⁹ *Samantabhadra-vacana-ratna-dīpaḥ* (No. 105, Rice 1889: 77, l. 6).

⁹⁰ *Samantabhadra-svāmi-gaḷuv Akalaṅka-Devaruṃ* (Rice 1898: 229).

⁹¹ *Śrīmat-Samantabhadra-svāmigaḷ Akalaṅka-Devarim* (Rice 1898: 245).

⁹² *śrīmat-svāmi-Samantabhadrar avarim Bhaṭṭākalāṅkākhya* (Rice 1898: 245).

⁹³ ĀP(J) 1.43, p. 10:

namaḥ samantabhadrāya kavi-vedhase |
yad-vaco-vajra-pātena nirminnāḥ kumatādyah ||

- in the *Hari-vaṃśa-purāṇa* of Punnāṭa Jinasena (c. 783; Vikrama Saṃvat 840), which quite importantly contains a direct reference to Samantabhadra's work *Yukty-anuśāsana*.⁹⁴
- perhaps also in the *Anekānta-jaya-patākā* (AJP) of Haribhadra-sūri (740–800), for Dhaky (2002: 31, 48, n. 29) alleges that Haribhadra refers to Samantabhadra by name, though I fail to spot that reference.

Further, as regards the date of the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* and of Pūjyapāda Devanandin, he is generally considered to be also the author of the *Sarvārtha-siddhi*, is normally assigned to the mid-sixth century, and there are strong reasons for this dating of at least in the case of the *Sarvārtha-siddhi*, including the fact that there is not slightest trace of Dharmakīrti's thought in his this text.

Concerning the two works of Devanandin, first, with respect to the date of his *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* alone, there are two different opinions, which are reflected in Hartmut Scharfe's (1977: 168) comment on the date of the grammar work: 'While some scholars place Devanandin before even Candragomin (5th cent. A.D.), others put him later than the authors of the *Kāśikā* (early 7th cent. A.D.)' Such divergent dating is due to two factors. Those favouring the latter date, refer to the Lakṣmeśvara inscription from Dharwad which was discovered and first published by Fleet (1884: 112), who is followed by other scholars, including Pathak (1883: 20) and Dikshīt (1980: 158), who in turn summarizes the argument: 'another epigraph from Lakshmeśvara inscription from Dharwar records the gift of a village Kardam, south of Pulikere, to Vinayāditya's priest Udayadeva Paṇḍita (Niravadya Paṇḍita), a disciple of Puḥjyapada of Devaguṇa sect, for the benefit of the temple of Śāṅkha Jinendra on the *Phālguna Purnimā* of Śaka year 651 = the 8th February AD 729.' It is extremely unlikely though that the Pūjyapāda of the Lakṣmeśvara inscription refers to Pūjyapāda Devanandin, first because 'Pūjyapāda' is not a proper name but a honorific title which could also attach to other names, second that such a late dating is incompatible with a possible date of another work of Devanandin, viz. the *Sarvārtha-siddhi*, i.e. before c. 600 CE.

Those who assign the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* to the second half of the fifth century relate it historically to Candragomin's *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*. However, there is evidence that either both works within non-Pāṇinian grammatical tradition are historically unrelated or that the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* predates the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*. Thus, Bronkhorst (2002), in support of his earlier publication (1983), argued that 'it has also been more satisfactorily established that the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* and the *Kāśikā* shared at least one earlier source (other than the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Jainendravākara*),' which also means that the dating of the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* is in a way independent of the date of the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*. Further, much earlier Pathak (1931–32) presented ample evidence for 'the priority of Candra to Pūjyapāda' and provided four proofs which were summarized by Belvalkar (1976: 53–54), who following Pathak (1931–32) and (1883), assigns the

⁹⁴ HVP 1..29, p. 3.11:

*jīva-siddhi-nidhāyīha kṛta-yukty-anuśāsanam /
vacaḥ samantabhadrasya vīrasyēva vijṛmbhate //*

Jainendra-vyākaraṇa to the second half of the fifth century: ‘Among his arguments (i.e. Pathak 1931–32) are: 1. the fact that the *Kāśīkā* seems to betray knowledge of the JV; 2. the circumstance that the *Jainendra-sūtra* alludes to Īśvaraḥṣṇa the author of the *Sāṅkhyakārikās* (who is assigned by dr Takakusu to AD 450) and to twelve year cycle of Jupiter to the heliacal rising system, a system which was in vogue in the time of the Early Kadamba kings and their contemporaries, the early Gupta kings; 3. the collateral evidence to be derived from later references to the *Jainendra* from the ninth century on. Thus the *Śākaṭyāna-śabdānuśāsana* (dated from 1025 AD) is largely indebted to JV. A *Digambara Darśanaśāstra* of 853 AD mentions a pupil of a certain Pūjyapāda as being the founder of *Drāviḍa-saṅgha*. Lastly, an inscription from the *Śankhabasti* temples at *Lakṣmeśvara* records a gift in Saka 652 (730 AD) of *Śrī-Pūjyapāda* to his house pupil although this last is not quite a trustworthy evidence, being not contemporaneous, and there might have been more than one Pūjyapāda.’

However, the point of fact is that there seems to be absolutely nothing which would preclude a later date for the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* than the second half of the fifth century, for the actual references to this work are quite late, from the ninth century onwards.⁹⁵ The only evidence which would speak in favour of the fifth century is an extremely vague and conjectural conviction that *Devanandin* must have lived when the twelve year cycle of Jupiter to the heliacal rising system was in vogue, and that was only in the time of the early Kadamba kings, but this is too weak a basis to serve as evidence for any sound historical estimate.

In addition, the date of the *Sarvārtha-siddhi* cannot be pushed further up towards the seventh century because of almost total absence of a discussion of the *anekānta-vāda*, except for the term itself, which incidentally occurs for the first time in *Jaina* literature (although it was apparently used by the *Ājīvikas*⁹⁶). The ideas which relate to the doctrine of multiplexity of reality are still quite robust and underdeveloped, and it is most unlikely that these would reflect the state of thought and knowledge of an educated *Jaina* author living in the seventh century. The total absence of any reference to *Dharmakīrti*’s ideas in the *Sarvārtha-siddhi* can be explained as follows. Pūjyapāda *Devanandin*, while composing a commentary of the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, wrote it primarily for the *Jaina* audience. The work generally avoids any longer criticism directed against other philosophical and religious schools. Accordingly, it is quite feasible to consider that Pūjyapāda *Devanandin* was an older contemporary of *Dharmakīrti* but did not refer to him for a range of reasons. Therefore, the reasonable time span within which Pūjyapāda *Devanandin*, alias *Jinendrabuddhi*, could flourish is some time between ca. 480 and ca. 600. And this fully complies with conjectural chronology and the proposed date for Pūjyapāda *Devanandin* as 540–600.

Consistent with this conjectural chronology, the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvaka-cāra* of *Samantabhadra* has to be his first work, both socially influential and important

⁹⁵ See Pathak (1931–32). The first commentary on (and redaction of) the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* is *Śabdārṇava-candrikā* of *Somadeva* dated 1025 CE or 1049 CE (Śaka 1127), and the even later commentary is the *Mahā-vṛtti* of *Abhayanandin*. *Somadeva* mentions his predecessor’s abridgement *Jainendra-prakriyā* of the grammar, composed some time after 962 CE (Śaka 1040).

⁹⁶ See Balcerowicz (forthcoming₂).

enough for Devanandin to make a reference to its author in his *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*. Samantabhadra could know only the earliest portions of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*, i.e. the *Svārthānumāna* chapter, which contained the criticism against a rather robust and undeveloped version of the *anekānta-vāda*. And this is the portion which he criticised in the three eulogies which he composed towards the end of his life.

With this in mind and with the material presented so far, the simplest conclusion, and most innocuous one, would be the following conjectural chronology of respective works and a conjectural dating for each author:

	Samantabhadra 530–590	Pūjyapāda Devanandin 540–600	Dharmakīrti 550–610
550	<i>Ratna-karaṇḍa- śrāvākācāra</i>		
560		<i>Sarvārtha-siddhi</i>	
570		<i>Jainendra-vyākaraṇa</i>	PV, <i>Svārthānumāna</i>
580	<i>Āpta-mīmāṃsā Yukty-anuśāsana Svayambhū-stotra</i>		

The above conjecture retains the integrity of each person, i.e. does not require to presuppose that there were more Devanandins or Samantabhadras than one. I do not claim that this dating is well fixed. On the contrary, the dates of the individual works and authors in the above conjectural table which reflects relative chronology can be adjusted plus/minus 20 years, but only within certain limits, e.g. they cannot be pushed further towards the seventh century.

In the conclusion of my 2011 paper, I indicated that there were a number of ‘points in Dharmakīrti’s account of the *anekānta-vāda* ... [which] significantly diverge from the genuine doctrine as it is represented by Jaina philosophers themselves.’ I left a possibility open, ‘that what Dharmakīrti depicts are some early developments of the theory’, though at that time I considered this option less likely than an intentional distortion of Jaina *syād-vāda* on the part of Dharmakīrti. Now, with the adjusted dating of Dharmakīrti, this possibility seems the more accurate description of the actual state of affairs, inasmuch as he must have indeed lived in the period when the Jainas were gradually developing their doctrine of multiplicity of reality, which at his times was still in a nascent stage.

9.3

The above hypothesis takes it for granted that, first, the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* and *Sarvārtha-siddhi* were composed by one and the same person, Devanandin, and that, second, Samantabhadra was the author of the four works, one titled *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra* on the Jaina lay conduct, and three epistemologically oriented eulogies. And this interpretation is what I consider most likely in view of the present state of

our historical knowledge. However, there is still another possibility, which I should outline below.

Whereas I see no tangible evidence to argue for two distinct Pūjyapādas, viz. one Pūjyapāda Devanandin as the author of the *Sarvārtha-siddhi* and the other Pūjyapāda Jinendrabuddhi as the author of the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*, there can be some evidence, hypothetically speaking, found in support of two different Samantabhadras. In this case, the crucial point is whether the *same* Samantabhadra is the author of all the works ascribed to an author bearing this name. It is not entirely impossible that there could in fact be at least two Samantabhadras: the first would be the author of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra*, who lived before Pūjyapāda Devanandin, perhaps around 500 CE, and the other the author of the three eulogies: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana*, *Svayambhū-stotra*, *Stuti-vidyā*, who flourished after Pūjyapāda Devanandin and Dharmakīrti, i.e. perhaps around 650. That being the case, the reference in the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa* of Pūjyapāda Devanandin would be to Samantabhadra I, i.e. the earlier author of the work on the conduct for lay Jains (*śrāvakācāra*).

While referring to Samantabhadra, Williams (1963: 19) says: ‘Many legends attach to his life but little can be said of it with certainty. He would seem to have been a native of the Tamil land and to have belonged to a *ḷṣatriya* family’ (quoted also in Shah 1999: 33). All these legends are medieval and allow us to associate Samantabhadra both with Tamiḷnāḍu and Karnāṭaka, depending on a particular legend, which developed in different locations long after the historical events. These legends do treat all works such as *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana*, *Svayambhū-stotra*, *Stuti-vidyā* and *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* as penned by one and the same author in a very same way as medieval legends ascribe a number or works to one and the same Siddhasena. In this case, the author of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* whom Williams had in mind could not be Samantabhadra II the Epistemologist.

There are some reasons which could be interpreted as attesting to the fact that the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* (RKŚĀ) was composed by someone else than the epistemologically oriented eulogist of *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana* and *Svayambhū-stotra*. As Shah (1999: 33) aptly noted, ‘His (Samantabhadra’s) authorship of *Āptamīmāṃsā*, *Svayambhūstotra* and *Yuktyanuśāsana* is beyond any doubt. They belong to the literary form called *stotra* (devotional poem). But they are philosophical in substance.’ All the three eulogies display, as I tried to demonstrate above, some acquaintance with the system of Dharmakīrti, and they can therefore be treated as one block, whereas the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* is the odd one out: I do not find a single idea in it which could in any way relate to Dharmakīrti.

The most conspicuous difference could be the character of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* which hardly contains epistemological issues and which has a layout or programme of which the author informs in the very beginning of the work in the first person: ‘I will demonstrate the correct moral law, which destroys *karman*’ (RKŚĀ₁ 1.2ab: *deśayāmi samīcīnaṃ dharmam...*). Neither this kind of first-person address nor clearly laid-out plan of a work are present in the three epistemological eulogies. At the same time, the outline of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvakācāra* is not a rigid and well-structured composition, and it could easily allow for an introduction of various

ideas which do not directly concern the rules of the proper code of lay Jainas. Similarly, all the three *stutis* are rather loose in their character, and certainly are not systematic exposition of philosophical doctrines. They deal with a range of issues which the author considers relevant to the praise the Ford-makers of Jainism, and they could incorporate themes which relate to a proper conduct. In other words, the material in all the four texts ascribed to Samantabhadra is not well systematised and their structures allow for an introduction of additional ideas. A comparison of the two groups of texts—RKŚĀ and the three *stutis/stotras*—and the analysis of their contents will not reveal any conspicuous contradictions between these two, which would immediately speak against their common authorship. They all are generally slightly ambiguous, vague, imprecise, informal, unsystematic. However, a juxtaposition of terminology and ideas reflected through the terms in both groups of texts, as in the table of sample terminology below, will be quite revealing.

Term	RKŚĀ	ĀMī	SvSt ₁₌₃	YA
<i>sukha, duḥkha, mokṣa, mokṣa-marga, etc.</i>	<i>passim</i>	<i>passim</i>	<i>passim</i>	<i>passim</i>
<i>liṅga / liṅgin</i>	1.30	68	7.3 = 33, 13.3 = 63	22, 43
<i>dharma</i> ('moral law')	1.2, 1.3, 1.16, 1.26, 1.29, 4.18, 4.21, 5.1		2.4 = 9,14.3 = 68, 15.1 = 71, 16.4 = 79, 17.1 = 81, 22.6 = 126	
<i>dharma</i> ('property')/ <i>dharmin</i> ('property- possessor')		10, 17, 18, 19, 22, 29, 35, 75, 106		48, 52, 60
<i>rāga</i>	1.6, 1.8, 1.23, 3.1, 3.2, 3.32, 3.36, 4.22	2		23, 52, 64, 64
<i>dveṣa</i>	1.6, 1.23, 3.1, 3.2, 3.32			64
<i>darśana</i> (= <i>samyag- darśana</i>)	1.31, 1.36, 1.40, 5.11			
<i>samyag-darśana</i>	1.4, 1.28, 1.35, 5.16			
<i>darśana</i> ('wrong outlook')	1.21, 3.1			
<i>mithyātvā</i>	1.34, 3.33			

Term	RKŚĀ	ĀMī	SvSt ₁₌₃	YA
<i>samyaktva</i>	1.34			
<i>samyag-jñāna</i>	2.4			
<i>cāriṭra</i>	1.31, 2.4			
<i>(pañca)mahā-vrata/ anuvrata</i>	Chapt. 3 passim, 4.11, 5.17			
<i>dāna</i>	2.29, 3.31, 4.21, 4.25, 4.26, 4.27			
<i>śraddhāna</i>	1.4, 1.12			
<i>hiṃsā / ahimsā</i>	1.24, 3.2, 3.3, 3.26, 2.29, 3.30, 3.31	52	21.4 = 119	38
reference to the <i>syād-vāda</i>		<i>passim</i>	<i>passim</i>	<i>passim</i>
<i>naya</i> ('viewpoint')		14, 20, 23, 101, 104, 106, 107, 108, 115	11.2 = 52, 13.1 = 61, 13.5 = 65, 18.16 = 101, 18.18 = 103, 21.3 = 118, 24.8 = 143	6, 51
<i>syād-vāda / syād-vādin</i>		13, 32, 55, 70, 74, 77, 82, 90, 94, 97, 101, 104, 105, 106, 113	3.4 = 14, 24.3 = 138	
<i>syāt</i> (functor)		11, 29, 103 (<i>syān- nipāta</i>), 112 (<i>syāt- kāra</i>)	9.2 = 42, 9.4 = 44, 13.4 = 64, 13.5 = 65 (<i>syāt-pada</i>), 18.13 = 98, 18.16 = 101, 18.17 = 102 (<i>syāc-chabda</i>), 19.2 = 107 (<i>syāt-pada</i>)	46 (<i>syāc- chabda</i>), YA 47

Term	RKŚĀ	ĀMī	SvSt ₁₌₃	YA
<i>ekānta</i> / <i>anekānta</i> (epistemological sense)		7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 24, 28, 32, 37, 39, 41, 55, 61, 67, 70, 74, 77, 79, 82, 82, 90, 94, 97, 103, 104, 107, 108, 115	3.4 = 14, 9.1 = 41, 11.4 = 54, 11.5 = 55, 18.8 = 93, 18.13 = 98, 18.18 = 103	47, 52
<i>ekānta</i> ('in a solitary place')	4.9			
<i>avinābhava</i> / <i>avinābhāva</i>		69, 75		
<i>vikalpa</i> ('conceptual construct')		23, 45, 46		17, 26, 56
<i>pramāṇa</i> / <i>apramāṇa</i>		12, 26, 37, 38, 79, 81, 83, 87, 101, 115	5.3 = 23, 11.2 = 52, 13.3 = 63, 18.18 = 103	6, 56
<i>sāmānya</i>		31, 34, 57, 61, 65, 66, 73, 111, 112,	13.2 = 62, 13.3 = 63, 13.4 = 64,	26, 40, 41, 43, 54, 61
<i>viśeṣa</i>		19, 31, 57, 63, 71, 72, 73, 106, 112, 114	13.2 = 62, 13.3 = 63, 13.4 = 64, 21.3 = 118,	25, 26, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 54, 61

As even a cursory comparison of some technical vocabulary reveals, we can speak of four categories of expressions. (1) The first comprises terminology and ideas which are present in *all* four texts. These are of most general and religious nature, such as *sukha*, *duḥkha*, *mokṣa*, *mokṣa-marga*, etc., but also those which may relate to a system of inference (*liṅga*, *liṅgin*), which predates even Dignāga. (2) Some terms occur in all the four texts with a notable change in meaning, e.g. *dharma* used in the sense of 'moral law' in RKŚĀ, whereas it (and a related term *dharmin*) never occurs in it in the sense of 'property' (and 'property-possessor'), whereas '*dharma*' is present in this ontological/epistemological sense in all three eulogies. (3) A range of other general terms, which one would expect to find in all the four religious texts, are present only RKŚĀ, such as *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *darśana*,

samyag-darśana, samyaktva, mithyātva, samyag-jñāna, cāritra, dāna, vratalmahāvratā, anuvratā, śraddhāna, etc., even though they could fit perfectly well the purpose of an eulogy in praise of a supreme religious teacher. Some of these (e.g. *hiṃsālahiṃsā*) are frequent in RKŚĀ, whereas their occurrence in the eulogies is rather incidental. (4) A range of other terms and ideas are entirely absent in RKŚĀ, which for instance has no single reference to the *syād-vāda* (even the name itself!), a doctrine which is of pivotal importance to the author of the three *stutis*. We find no single occurrence in RKŚĀ of such crucial terms as *naya*, *syād-vādalsyād-vādin*, *syāt* in the meaning of the sentential functor ('in a certain sense'), *ekāntalānekānta* in epistemological sense, etc. The word *ekānta* is used only once in RKŚĀ, but in an entirely quotidian meaning of 'in a solitary place, alone, aside'. Even such important terms as *vikalpa* or *pramāṇa* are not attested in RKŚĀ. The categories 2, 3 and 4 demonstrate that the authors of the two groups of texts—RKŚĀ and the three *stutis*—were interested in a completely different range of topics and ideas, even though all such terms and ideas could easily find their equal place in all the four texts, and the open format of all these texts would allow for their introduction. That being the case, one could further argue, the authors were clearly concerned with entirely different worlds of concepts and spectra of ideas, and each of them was seriously engrossed in a separate world. The way we can terminologically, semantically, eidetically, conceptually group the three eulogies under one heading, their relation to Dharmakīrti aside, we cannot apply the same procedure to RKŚĀ to any degree. And there is internally and structurally nothing in all the four texts which would exclude the use of some of the technical vocabulary referred to above. Since these do not occur, a possible conclusion could be that we deal here with two different authors, Samantabhadra I as the author of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*, who must have lived before the composition of the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*, and Samantabhadra II, the author of the three *stutis*: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana* and *Svayambhū-stotra*, who was a contemporary of or lived after Dharmakīrti. It should be stressed, however, that such evidence is not compelling, inasmuch as one could maintain that separate topics of such divergent works as the *śrāvākācāra* treatise and the three epistemological eulogies determine a selection of dissimilar vocabulary. As long as we can place all the three authors, i.e. Pūjyapāda Devanandin, Samantabhadra and Dharmakīrti roughly in the sixth century, there is no reason to adopt the hypothesis of two Samantabhadras.

If we follow this hypothetical track, we should bear in mind that a reference to 'Samantabhadra' in a textual or epigraphic source does not necessarily have to imply the author of the three epistemological *stutis*. This can be a reference to one of at least two (or even three) Samantabhadras. No doubt, internal evidence based on a careful reading of the three epistemologically oriented eulogies ascribed to Samantabhadra, i.e. *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana* and *Svayambhū-stotra*, shows that these were written by one and the same person who must have been acquainted with Dharmakīrti's ideas and who directly criticised some points brought up by the latter against the Jaina doctrine of multiplexity of reality (*ānekānta-vāda*) in his *Pramāṇa-vārttikal-svayṛtti* 3.181–184. Whether this Samantabhadra is identical with the author of the *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*, is a different matter. If he is, then the latter is the Samantabhadra I who is mentioned in the grammar *Jainendra-*

vyākaraṇa by Pūjyapāda Devanandin, who also composed the *Sarvārtha-siddhi*, and should then be assigned to the mid-sixth century.

The author of *Stuti-vidyā* cannot be the same as Samantabhadra who composed the three epistemological *stutis*.

With such a hypothetical reasoning based on the assumption that Dharmakīrti did flourish between 600–660, as Frauwallner claimed, I would tentatively suggest the following dates for Samantabhadras:

- Samantabhadra I, who composed *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*: late fifth century CE (c. 500?), given the date of Pūjyapāda Devanandin c. 500–560;
- Samantabhadra II, who was the author of the *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yukty-anuśāsana* and *Svayambhū-stotra*: c. 600–660, i.e. a contemporary of Dharmakīrti;
- Samantabhadra III, the author of the *Stuti-vidyā*: date still to be decided.

In this way, the traditional sequence of Jaina teachers found in Inscriptions No. 105/254 and 108/258 of Śravaṇabeḷagoḷa⁹⁷—namely: Umāsvāti, Samantabhadra, Śivakoṭi-sūri, Pūjyapāda Devanandin, Bhaṭṭākalaṅka, Jinasena-sūri—could be explained as follows. In about six to seven centuries which lapsed since the times of two Samantabhadras, the memory of their distinctness faded, and Samantabhadra I and II merged into one, in the same way as it happened to two Siddhasenas, viz. Siddhasena Mahāmati (c. 710/720–770/780), author of the *Nyāyāvatāra*, and Siddhasena Divākara (c. 480–540), the author of the *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇa*,⁹⁸ or to a number of Jaina teachers bearing the name Jinasena.

Jaina itinerant mendicants were particularly prone to lose their distinct identities which were predisposed to be blurred and merge into one personage due to their wandering lifestyles. This process was responsible for the merging of different persons bearing the same or similar name into one in the course of Jaina monastic history.

Conclusion

What I have laid out in the preceding Sect. 9.3, is still a distant possibility, which I consider rather unlikely at this stage of research. However, it would become quite plausible if it proves impossible to readjust Dharmakīrti's dating to the sixth century.

The dates for Dharmakīrti proposed by Erich Frauwallner (1961), i.e. between 600–660, rest primarily on the juxtaposition of the travelogues of two Chinese pilgrims who visited Nālandā university where Dharmakīrti is known to have taught. The first of them, Xuanzang (602–664), who visited Nālandā during his travel to India between 629–641, apparently⁹⁹ was completely silent on Dharmakīrti, even though he did mention the names of some renowned Buddhist thinkers teaching at Nālandā. On the other hand Yijing (635–713) travelled to Nālandā

⁹⁷ See Rice (1889: 76–77, 82).

⁹⁸ See Balcerowicz (2009: ix–xlix).

⁹⁹ This alleged silence is questioned by Kimura (1999: 209 and n. 2).

during his trip to India between 673–685 and included Dharmakīrti's name among the prominent teachers of the university. This dating based on the argument of Xuanzang's silence has been questioned before. One of such attempts was made by Lindtner (1980) and (1992) who suggested 530–600 (partly on the basis of the problematic dating of the *Madhyamaka-ratna-pradīpa* and its attribution to Bhāviveka, etc.), a view challenged by Steinkellner (1991). Also Kimura (1999), mainly on the basis of circumstantial evidence of Chinese sources, attempted to push Dharmakīrti's date back to 550–620. These views were received with caution by e.g. Dunne (Dunne 1999: 1, n. 2), who concluded that 'the dates of Dharmakīrti are far from certain'. Similarly cautious remains Tillemans (2000" xiii–xv). The most recent attempt to reconsider Frauwallner's dating has been undertaken by Krasser (2011)/(2012), who reexamines the relations between Dharmakīrti, Kumāriila, Bhāviveka and Sthiramati, and demonstrates that the latter two philosophers, both belonging perhaps to around 500–570, knew of Dharmakīrti. Krasser accordingly pushes Dharmakīrti's activity back to the middle of the sixth century.

Established educational institutions, particularly religious ones, and these primarily aim at preservation of religious heritage rather than at a free exercise of critical reason, are generally not interested in intellectual criticism and novel or most complex philosophical interpretations. It should therefore not be so surprising to find that direct recipients of Dharmakīrti's thought or the next generation were reluctant to promote Dharmakīrti's name to the pantheon of the most illustrious doctors of their university.

Besides, as Dharmakīrti himself expressed in the bitter conclusion of his work, he must have felt he lived in a rather inimical milieu which did not quite accept his novel views:

'My philosophy, the depth of which has not been apprehended even by those whose intellectual power is not small at all, the essence of which is the ultimate truth unfathomable even to those who persevere in their utmost effort [to grasp it], [and] which makes one understand even [things] in the world which equal something ungraspable, will perish with old age in my body just like waters in an ocean.'¹⁰⁰

The fact that the stanza does not occur in the editions of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* preserved in the commentaries, but is instead quoted in the *Dhvanyāloka* (DhĀ 3.41) and clearly attributed by Ānandavardhana to Dharmakīrti (*tathā cāyam dharmakīrteḥ śloka iti prasiddhiḥ*), may attest to a temporary suppression of Dharmakīrti's thought in the curricula of Nālandā and to the change of the attitude of the Nālandā academics, some of whom, as commentators—once they considered the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* a valuable work worth commenting—considered the final remark inappropriate and removed it.

¹⁰⁰ PV₅ / PV₆ 4.286:

*anadhyavasitāvagāhanam analpa-dhī-śaktināpy
adṛṣṭa-paramārtha-sāram adhikābhīyogair api /
mataṁ mama jagaty alabdha-sadṛṣa-pratiḡrāhakam
prayāsyati payo-nidheḥ paya iva sva-dehe jarām ||*

In addition, it is not the case that the first reaction to or critique of Dharmakīrti's thought came from the pen of Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa (c. 720–780). As I indicated elsewhere (Balcerowicz (2009: i–ii), a Jaina philosopher who was directly influenced by Dharmakīrti's system of logic and to whom Akalaṅka was indebted was Siddhasena Mahāmāti (circa 710/720–770/780), whose dating is primarily dependent on Dharmakīrti's date, and can also be pushed slightly back. And now we also have evidence that also Samantabhadra reacted to Dharmakīrti. Thus, the argument that if Dharmakīrti had flourished in the sixth century, the absence of any reaction to his philosophy from non-Buddhistic circles for 150 years until Akalaṅka could not be accounted for can easily be dismissed.

In view of that fact that Frauwallner's dating of Dharmakīrti between 600–660 has been questioned recently more than once, in view of the present evidence the most plausible relative chronology seems to be the following one:

Samantabhadra, 530–590,
Pūjyapāda Devanandin, 540–600,
Dharmakīrti, 550–610.

As we can see, Dharmakīrti's ideas are crucial for determining the date of Digambara Samantabhadra and his identity (one or two authors of the same name?). At the same time, any new attempt to date Dharmakīrti should take into account the time of Samantabhadra, the epistemologist-eulogist, as a *terminus ante quem*.

Acknowledgment Work on this paper has been generously supported by the National Science Centre of Poland (Research Project: History of Classical Indian Philosophy: non-Brahmanic Schools, National Science Centre, 2011/01/B/HS1/04014).

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

Bibliography

- A = Pāṇini: *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. (1) Sumitra Mangesh Katre: *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Roman Transliteration*. University of Texas Press, Austin 1987 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1989]. (2) Śrīśa Chandra Vasu: *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, edited and translated into English*. 2 Vols., The Pāṇini Office, Allahabad 1891 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1962, 1977, 1980, 1988]. (3) Sharma, Rama Nath: *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vols. 1–6 [Vol. 1: *Introduction of the Aṣṭādhyāyī as a Grammatical Device*, Vols. 2–6: *English Translation of Adhāyāyas with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-Boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Note, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices*]. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, New Delhi 2003.
- Abhyankar 1967 = Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev (ed.): *Paribhāṣāsamgraha. A collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās*. Post-graduate and Research Department Series 7, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1967.
- ACM = Ajitasena: *Alaṅkāra-cintā-maṇi*. Nemicandra Śāstrī (ed.): *Alaṅkāra-cintā-maṇi of Mahākavi Ajitasena*. Jñāna-pīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina-grantha-mālā saṃskṛta granthāka 43, Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Kāśī 1973.
- AJP = Haribhadra-sūri: *Anekānta-jaya-patākā*. H. R. Kāpadī (ed.): *Anekāntajayapatākā by Haribhadra Sūri with his own commentary and Municandra Sūri's supercommentary*. 2 Vols., Gaekwad's Oriental Series 88, 105, Oriental Institute, Baroda 1940, 1947.
- ĀMī = Samantabhadra: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*. (1) Pannālāl Jain (ed.): *Ācārya-śrī-samantabhadra-svāmi-viracitā Āpta-mīmāṃsāsyād-vāda-vidyāpati-śrī-vidyānanda-svāmi-viracitā pramāṇa-parīkṣā ca*.

- Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā 7, 8, Kāśī (Benares) 1914. (2) See: Shah (1999). (3) See: AṣṢ. (4) See: Mukhtār (1967). (4) See: Jain (1976).
- ĀP(J) = Jinasena: *Ādi-purāṇa*. Pannalal Jain (ed.): *Ādipurāṇa of Āchārya Jinasena*. Sanskrit text with Hindi translation. Eighth/Seventh Edition. Part 1 & 2. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā 8, 9, Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Delhi 2000/2001.
- AṣṢ = Akalaṅka: *Aṣṭa-śatī*. See: ĀMī, AṣṢ.
- AṣṢ = Vidyānanda Pātrakesarisvāmin: *Aṣṭa-sahasrī*. (1) Vaṃśīdhar (ed.): *Aṣṭa-sahasrī tārīka-cakra-cūdā-maṇi-syādvāda-vidyāpatinā śrī-Vidyānanda-svāminā nirākṛta*. Nirṇaya-sāgara Press, Bombay 1915. (2) Darbārī Lāl Koṭhiyā; Brahmācārī Sandīpa Jain (eds.): *Tārīka-śiromaṇi ācārya vidyānanda-kṛta Aṣṭa-sahasrī*. Jaina-vidyā Saṃsthāna, Digambara Jaina Atīśaya Kṣetra, Śrīmahāvīrajī (Rājasthān) 1997.
- AṣṢTV = Yaśovijaya-gaṇi: *Aṣṭa-sahasrī-tātparya-vivaraṇa*. Muni Vairāgyarati Vijaya (ed.): *Śrī-Yaśovijaya-gaṇi-viracitam Aṣṭa-sahasrī-tātparya-vivaraṇam*. [A Commentary on Vidyānanda Pātrakesarisvāmin's *Aṣṭa-sahasrī*]. 2 Vols., Pravacan Prakāś, Pūnā 2004.
- Balcerowicz 2009 = Balcerowicz, Piotr: *Jaina Epistemology in Historical and Comparative Perspective. Critical Edition and English Translation of Logical-Epistemological Treatises: Nyāyāvātāra, Nyāyāvātāra-vivṛti and Nyāyāvātāra-tippaṇa with Introduction and Notes. Second revised edition*. 2 Vols., Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi 2009 [first edition: Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 53, 1–2, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2001].
- Balcerowicz 2011 = Balcerowicz, Piotr: 'Dharmakīrti's criticism of the Jaina doctrine of multiplexity of reality (*anekānta-vāda*)', in: Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, Eli Franco, Birgit Kellner (eds.): *Religion and Logic in Buddhist Philosophical Analysis. Proceedings of the Fourth International Dharmakīrti Conference Vienna, August 23–27, 2005*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 424. Band, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2011: 1–31.
- Balcerowicz 2014 = Balcerowicz, Piotr: 'Introduction: On attempts to formalise the *syād-vāda*', in: Piotr Balcerowicz; Karl H. Potter (eds.): *Jain Philosophy (Part Three)*, Vol. XVII: *Encyclopedia Of Indian Philosophies* (General editor: Karl H. Potter), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2014: 29–51.
- Balcerowicz (forthcoming₁) = Balcerowicz, Piotr: 'Do attempts to formalise the *syād-vāda* make sense?', a paper presented at: 11th Jaina Studies Workshop: Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy, SOAS, London 12–13.03.2009. To be published in: Peter Flügel (ed.): *Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy. Willem B. Bollée Festschrift*, Routledge (forthcoming).
- Balcerowicz (forthcoming₂) = Balcerowicz, Piotr: *Early Asceticism in India. Ājīvikism and Jainism*. Routledge, 2015 (forthcoming).
- Belvalkar 1976 = Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna: *An Account of the Different Existing Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*. Second revised edition, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi 1976 [first edition: Poona 1915].
- Bronkhorst 1983 = Bronkhorst, Johannes: 'On the History of Pāṇinian Grammar in the Early centuries Following Pātañjali', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11 (1983) 357–412.
- Bronkhorst 2002 = Bronkhorst, Johannes: 'The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa: Some Questions', in: Madhav M. Deshpande; Peter E. Hook (eds.): *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2002: 182–201.
- Chatterjee 1978 = Chatterjee, Asim Kumar: *A Comprehensive History of Jainism. Part I (up to 1000 A. D.)*, Firma KLM, Calcutta 1978.
- DhĀ = Ānandavardhana: *Dhvanyāloka*. (1) Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda; Wāsudev Laxmaṇ S'astrī Paṇḍitkar (eds.): *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhanācārya With the Commentary of Abhinavaguptācārya*. Third edition, Kāvya-mālā 25, Pāndurang Jāvājī, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1928. (2) K. Krishnamoorthy (ed.): *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*. Second edition, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1982.
- Dhaky 2002 = Dhamkī, Madhusūdan (M.A. Dhaky): 'Svāmī Samantabhadra-no Samay' (in Gujarātī), in: Madhusūdan Dhamkī: *Nirgranth Aitihāsik Lekh-Samuccay*. (in Gujarātī). 2 Vols., Śreṣṭhī Kastūrbhāi Lālbhāi Śreṇi 4–5, Śreṣṭhī Kastūrbhāi Lālbhāi Smāraknidhi, Amdāvād (Ahmedabad) 2002: 28–51.
- DhPr = Durvekamiśra: *Dharmottara-pradīpa*. Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania (ed.): *Paṇḍita Durveka Miśra's Dharmottara-pradīpa [being a subcommentary on Dharmottara's Nyāya-bindu-īkā, a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Nyāya-bindu]*. Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1955 [reprinted: 1971].
- Dikshit 1980 = Dikshit, Durga Prasad: *Political History of the Chālukyas of Badami*. Shakti Malik Abhinav Publications, Delhi 1980.

- DMP = Jitāri: *Digambara-mata-parīkṣā*. H.R. Rangaswamy Iyengar (ed.): *Tarkabhāṣā and Vādasthāna of Mokṣākaragupta and Jitāripāda*. The Hindustan Press, Mysore 1944.
- DNC = Mallavādīn Kṣamāśramaṇa: *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra*. Muni Jambūvijayajī (ed.): *Dvādaśāraṇa Nayacakram of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādī Kṣamāśramaṇa. With the commentary Nyāyāgamānūsārīṇī of Ācārya Śrī Simhasarī Gaṇi Vādī Kṣamāśramaṇa*. Edited with critical notes by ... Pt. I (1–4 Aras), Śrī-Jaina-Ātmānaṃda-sabhā, Bhāvnagar 1966 [reprinted: Bhāvnagar 2000]; Pt. II (5–8 Aras): Bhāvnagar 1976; Pt. III (9–12 Aras): Bhāvnagar 1988.
- Dunne 1999 = Dunne, John Dowling: *Foundations of Dharmakīrti's philosophy: A study of the central issues in his ontology, logic and epistemology with particular attention to the Svopajñavṛtti*. Unpublished thesis presented to the Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1999.
- Faddegon 1935 = Faddegon, Barend (transl.): *The Pravacana-sāra of Kunda-kunda Ācārya together with the commentary Tattva-dīpikā, by Amṛtacandra Sūri*. Jain Literature Society Series 1, University Press, Cambridge 1935.
- Fleet 1884 = Fleet, J.F.: 'Inscriptions of Satyāśraya, of Vijāyaditya, Ś. 651, of Gaṅga-Kandarpa, Ś. 890, and of Vinayāditya, Ś. 608', *The Indian Antiquary* 7 (1884) 111–112.
- Folkert 1993 = Folkert, Kendall W.: *Scripture and Community. Collected Essays on the Jains*. Ed. by John E. Cort, Scholars Press, Atlanta (Georgia) 1993.
- Frauwallner 1961 = Frauwallner, Erich: 'Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5 (1961) 125–148.
- Fujinaga 2001 = Fujinaga, Sin: *Jainakṣyō no issaichi chisharon (The Theory of the Omniscient Person of Jainism)*. Heirakuji Shoten, Kyōto 2001 [quoted after Shiga (2013)].
- Fujinaga 2006 = Fujinaga, Sin: 'Why must there be an Omniscient in Jainism?'. In: Peter Flügel (ed.): *Studies in Jaina History and Culture*, Routledge Advances in Jaina Studies, Routledge, London–New York 2006: 107–116.
- Ganeri 1999 = Ganeri, Jonardon: 'Dharmakīrti's Semantics for the particle *eva*', in: Shoryu Katsura (ed.): *Dharmakīrti's Thought and its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4–6, 1997*. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens Nr. 32, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 1999: 101–115.
- Ghoshal 2002 = Ghoshal, Saratchandra (ed., tr.): *Āpta-mīmāṃsā of Āchārya Samantabhadra. Edited with Introduction, Translation, Notes and An Original Commentary in English*. Bharatiya Jnanpith, Delhi 2002.
- Gillon 1999 = Gillon, Brendan, S.: 'Another look at the Sanskrit particle *eva*', in: Shoryu Katsura (ed.): *Dharmakīrti's Thought and its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4–6, 1997*. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens Nr. 32, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 1999: 117–130.
- Handiqui 1968 = Handiqui, Krishna Kanta: *Yāśastilaka and Indian Culture or Somadeva's Yāśastilaka and Aspects of Jainism and Indian Thought and Culture in the Tenth Century*. Jain Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣak Saṅgha, Solāpur 1968 [first edition: Jīvarāja Jaina Grantha-mālā 2, Ṣolāpur 1949].
- Hayes 1988 = Hayes, Richard P.: *Dignāga on the Interpretation of Signs*. Studies of Classical India 9, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht 1988.
- HVP = Punnāta Jinasena: *Hari-vaṃśa-purāṇa*. Pt. Panna Lal Jain (ed.): *Harivaṃśa Purāṇa of Āchārya Jinasena*. Sanskrit text with Hindi translation. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā 27, Vārāṇasī 1962 [reprinted: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Delhi 2001].
- Jain 1976 = Jain, Udayachandra (ed.): *Āpta-mīmāṃsā-tattva-dīpikā*. Varṇī Śātābdī ke Avasarpār, Śrī Gaṇeś Varṇī Dī. Jaina Saṃsthān Prakāśan, Vārāṇasī 1976 (Vīra Saṃ. 2501).
- Jainī 1979 = Jainī, Padmanabh S.: *The Jaina Path of Purification*. University of California Press, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1979 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1998].
- JV = Pūjyapāda Devanandin: *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*. (1) Vindhyaśvarī Prasād Dvivedī (ed.): *Jainendra-vyākaraṇam Devanandi-muni-kṛtam. Abhayaṇandi-muni-kṛta-mahā-vṛtti-sahitam*. Gavnarṇeṭṭ-saṃskṛt-kālej Pustakālay, Banaras 1910. (2) Śambhunātha Tripāṭhī; Mahādeva Caturvedī (eds.): *Pūjyapāda-devanandi-viracitam Jainendra-vyākaraṇam tasya ṭikā ācārya-Abhayanandi-praṇīta Jainendra-mahā-vṛttih*. Jñāna-pīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina-grantha-mālā saṃskṛta granthāka 17, Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Kāśī 1956.
- Katsura 1985 = Katsura, Shoryu: 'On Trairūpya Formulae', in: *Buddhism and its relation to other religions. Essays in honour of Dr. Shozen Kumoi on his seventieth birthday*. Heirakuji Shoten, Kyoto 1985: 161–172.

- Katsura 1986 = Katsura, Shoryu: 'On the origin and development of the concept of *vyāpti* in Indian logic', *The Journal of Hiroshima Philosophical Society/Hiroshima Tetsugakkai* 38 (1986) 1–16.
- Kimura 1999 = Kimura, Toshihiko: 'A New Chronology of Dharmakīrti,' in: Shoryu Katsura (ed.): *Dharmakīrti's Thought and its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4–6, 1997*. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens Nr. 32, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1999: 209–214.
- Krasser 2011 = Krasser, Helmut: 'Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa,' in: Toru Funayama (ed.): *Chūgoku-Indo syūkyū-shi tokuni bukkyū-shi ni okeru syomotsu no ryūtsū-denpa to jinbutsu-idin no chiiki-tokusei* [Regional characteristics of text dissemination and relocation of people in the history of Chinese and Indian religions, with special reference to Buddhism]. A Report of Grant-In-Aid for Scientific Research (B): Project Number 19320010. University of Kyoto, Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo, March, 2011: 193–242.
- Krasser 2012 = Krasser, Helmut: 'Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa,' in: François Voegeli; Vincent Eltschinger; Danielle Feller; Maria Piera Candotti; Bogdan Diaconescu; Malhar Kulkarni (eds.): *Devadattīyam. Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*. Welten Süd- und Zentralasiens 5, Peter Lang Verlag, Bern–Berlin–Bruxelles–Frankfurt am Main–New York–Oxford–Wien 2012: 535–594.
- Lahiri 2007 = Lahiri, Ratna: 'Samantabhadra (430?). *Āptamīmāṃsā*,' in: Dalsukh Malvania; Jayendra Soni (eds.): *Jain Philosophy (Part One)*, Vol. XVII: *Encyclopedia Of Indian Philosophies* (General editor: Karl H. Potter), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2007: 139–154.
- Lindtner 1980 = Lindtner, Christian: 'Apropos Dharmakīrti—Two New Works and a New Date', *Acta Orientalia* 41 (1980) 27–37.
- Lindtner 1992 = Lindtner, Christian: 'On the Date of Dharmakīrti etc.', *The Brahmavidyā: Adyar Library Bulletin* 56 (1992) 56–62.
- MŚV = Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa: *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika*. (1) Dvārikādāsa Śāstrin (ed.): *Śloka-vārttika of Śrī Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa with the Commentary Nyāya-ratnākara of Śrī Pārthasarāthi Mīra*. Prāchyabhāratī Series 3, Tārā Publications, Varanasi 1978.
- Mukhtār 1925 = Mukhtār, Jugalkishore (Jugalkiśor): *Svāmī Samantabhadra (itihās)*. Jaina-grantha-ratnākara Kāryālay, Hīrābāg, Bambaī (Bombay) 1925.
- Mukhtār 1926 = Mukhtār, Jugalkishore (Jugalkiśor): See: RKŚĀ₁.
- Mukhtār 1934 = Mukhtār, Jugalkishore (Jugalkiśor): 'Samantabhadra's Date and Dr. Pathak', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 15,1 (1933–34) 67–88.
- Mukhtār 1949 = Mukhtār, Jugalkishore (Jugalkiśor): 'Sanmati Siddhasenānka', *Anekānta* 9, 11–12 (1949).
- Mukhtār 1967 = Mukhtār, Jugalkiśor (ed.): *Śrīmat-svāmī-Samantabhadracārya-varya-viracita Devāgama aparānāma Āpta-mīmāṃsā*. Vīra-sevā-mandir-trast-prakāśan, Vārāṇasī 1967.
- Narasimhachar 1923 = Narasimhachar, R.: *Epigraphia Carnatica*. Vol. II: *Inscriptions At Sravana Belgola*. Revised Edition, Mysore Archaeological Series, Mysore Government Central Press, Bangalore 1923.
- NB = Dharmakīrti: *Nyāya-bindu*. (1) Th. Stcherbatsky (ed.): *Nyāya-bindu-fīkā of Dharmottara with Nyāya-bindu of Dharmakīrti*. Buddhica 7, St. Pétersbourg 1918 [reprinted: Biblio Verlag, Osnabrück 1970]. (2) See: DhPr.
- Ohira 1982 = Ohira, Suzuki: *A Study of the Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya with Special Reference to Authorship and Date*. Lalbhāi Dalpatbhāi Series 86, Bharatiya Sanskrit Vidyamandir – L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1982.
- Pathak 1930a = Pathak, K.B.: 'On the Date of Samantabhadra', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 11,2 (1930) 149–154.
- Pathak 1930b = Pathak, K.B.: 'Śāntarākṣita's Reference to Kumāriḷa's Attacks on Samantabhadra and Akalaṅkadeva', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 11,2 (1930) 155–164.
- Pathak 1931 = Pathak, K.B.: 'Kumāriḷa's Verses Attacking the Jain and Buddhist Notions of an Omniscient Being', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 12,2 (1931) 123–131.
- Pathak 1931–32 = Pathak, K.B.: 'The text of the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa and the priority of Candra to Pūjyapāda', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 13 (1931–32) 25–36.
- Pind 2009 = Pind, Ole Holten: *Dignāga's Philosophy of Language. Dignāga on anyāpoha. Pramāṇa-samuccaya V 1–50. Texts, Translation, and Annotation*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte, Vienna 2009.

- Potter 2007 = Potter, Karl H.: 'Samantabhadra, *Yuktyanuśāsana*', in: Dalsukh Malvania; Jayendra Soni (eds.): *Jain Philosophy (Part One)*, Vol. XVII: *Encyclopedia Of Indian Philosophies* (General editor: Karl H. Potter), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2007: 154–158.
- Premī 1956 = Premī, Nātūrām: *Jaina sāhitya aur itihās*. Hemacandra Modī, Hindī-grantha-ratnākara Kāryālay, Bombay 1956.
- PS = Dignāga: *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*. (1) Chapter I, see: Hattori (1968). (2) In: DNC (Muni Jambūvijayaji), Pt. I, pp. 97–134. (3) Chapter I, see: Steinkellner (2005).
- PST = Jinendrabuddhi: *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-ṭīkā*. Ernst Steinkellner; Helmut Krasser; Horst Lasic (ed.): *Jinendrabuddhi's Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā: Chapter 1. Part I: Critical Edition. Part II: Diplomatic Edition*. 2 Vols. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften/China Tibetology Publishing House, Beijing–Vienna 2005.
- PSV = Dignāga: *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti*. Chapter I, see: PS₃ / Steinkellner (2005).
- PV = Dharmakīrti: *Pramāṇa-vārttika*. (1) Dalasukh Mālavanīyā (ed.): *Ācārya Dharmakīrti kṛta Svārthānumāna-pariccheda*. General Edition: V.S. Agarwala, Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series 2, Varanasi [1959]. (2) Raniero Gnoli (ed.): *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti, the First Chapter with the Autocommentary. Text and Critical Notes*. Serie Orientale Roma 23, Ismeo, Roma 1960. (3) Ram Chandra Pandeya (ed.): *The Pramāṇa-vārttikam of Ācārya Dharmakīrti with Sub-commentaries: Svṃpajña-vṛtti of the Author and Pramāṇa-vārttika-vṛtti of Manorathanandin*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1989. (4) Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana (ed.): *Pramāṇavārttikam Ācārya-Manorathanandi-kṛtayaḥ vṛtṭyā saṃvalitam [Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttikam with a commentary by Manorathanandin]*. Parts I–II, Appendix to *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 24–26, Patna 1938–1940. [The chapter numbering in the present paper follows this edition: PV₄]. (5) Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana (ed.): *Pramāṇa-vārttikam by Ācārya Dharmakīrti. The Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 24, Bihar and Orissa Research Society Patna 1938. (6) Yūsho Miyasaka (ed.): 'Pramāṇa-vārttika-kārikā (Sanskrit and Tibetan).' [Chapter 2 = *Pramāṇa-siddhi*, Chapter 3 = *Pratyakṣa*, Chapter 4 = *Parārthānumāna*]. *Acta Indologica [Īndo-koten-kenkyū]* 2 (1971/72) 1–206 [Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji].
- PVSV = Dharmakīrti: *Pramāṇa-vārttika-svavṛtti*. See: PV.
- PVSVṬ = Karṇakagomin: *Pramāṇa-vārttika-svavṛtti-ṭīkā*. Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana (ed.): *Ācārya-Dharmakīrteḥ Pramāṇa-vārttikam (svārthānumāna-paricchedaḥ) svopajña-vṛtṭyā Karṇakagomiviracitayā taṭ-ṭīkayā ca sahitam*. Kitāb Mahal, Ilāhābād [Allahabad] 1943 [reprinted: Kyoto 1982].
- Rice 1889 = Rice, B[enjamin] Lewis: *Inscriptions at Śravaṇa Belgola, a chief seat of the Jains*. Mysore Government Central Press, Mysore 1889.
- Rice 1898 = Rice, B[enjamin] Lewis: *Inscriptions in the Mysore District, Part II. Epigraphica Carnatica*. Vol. 4, Mysore Archaeological Series, Mysore Government Press, Bangalore 1898.
- RKŚĀ = Samantabhadra: *Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāra*. (1) Mukhtār, Jugalkiśor (ed.): *Śrīmat-Samantabhadra-svāmi-viracito Ratna-karaṇḍa-śrāvākācāraḥ śrī-Prabhācandrācārya-nirmīta-ṭīkōpetaḥ*. Maṇīkacandra Di. Jaina-grantha-mālā 24, Maṇīkacandra Di. Jainagrantha-mālā-samītiḥ, Bombay 1926 (Vīra-Saṃvat 2451/Vikrama-Saṃvat 1982). (2) *Śrī Ratnakaraṇḍa Śrāvākācāra*. Śrī Madhyakṣetrīya Mumukṣu Maṇḍala Saṅgha, Sagara (Madhya Pradesh) 1983 [reprinted: 1985]. (3) Darśan Sāgar; Khūbcand Jain Śāstrī (eds.): *Kavi-vedhā tārīka-cūḍā-maṇi śrī-Samantabhadrācārya-viracita Ratna-karaṇḍa Śrāvākācāra kī Bhāṣā-ṭīkā*. Śrī Digambara Jaina Samāj, Gāṃdhī Nagar, Dillī 1990 (Vī. Saṃ. 2515). (4) Bharata-sāgara-jī Mahā-rāja (ed.): *Śrī Samantabhadrācārya-viracita Ratna-karaṇḍa Śrāvākācāra*. Ācārya Śrī Vimāla-sāgara-jī Mahā-rāja Hīraka Jayantī Prakāśana Mālā no. 64, Śrī Bharatavarṣīya Anekānta Vidvad Pariṣat, Sonāgīr [no date of publication]. (4) Champat Rai Jai (transl.): *The Ratna Karanda Sravakachara or the Householder's Dharma of Sri Samanta Bhadracharya Translated into English*. Sri Jain Matt / Dhavalathraya Trust, Moodbidri 1931. (5) Willem Bollée: *Ratnakaraṇḍaka Shravakacara*. Edited, translated and annotated. Pandit Nathuram Premi Research Series 41, Hindi Granth Karyalay, Mumbai 2012.
- RVār = Akalaṅka: *Tattvārtha-vārttika (Rāja-vārttika)*. Mahendra Kumar Jain (ed.): *Tattvārtha-vārttika [Rāja-vārttika] of Śrī Akalaṅkadeva*. Edited with Hindi Translation, Introduction, appendices, variant readings, comparative notes etc. Parts I–II. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā: Sanskrit Grantha 10, 20, Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Delhi 1953–1957 [2. edition: Delhi 1982].
- Scharfe 1977 = Scharfe, Hartmut: *Grammatical Literature*. In the series: Jan Gonda (ed.): *A History of Indian Literature*: Vol. V, fasc. 2, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1977.
- Shah 1999 = Shah, Nagin (ed., tr.): *Samantabhadra's Āptamīmāṃsā. Critique of an Authority [Along with English Translation, Introduction, Notes and Akalaṅka's Sanskrit Commentary Aṣṭaśatī]*. Sanskrit-Sanskriti Grantha-mālā, Dr. Jagruti Dilip Sheth, Ahmedabad 1999.

- Shiga 2013 = Shiga, Kiyokuni: 'Conflicts and Interactions between Jaina Logicians and Arcaṭa', *Journal of Jaina Studies* 19 (2013) 19–68.
- SSi = Pūjyapāda Devanandin: *Sarvārtha-siddhi*. (1) Phoolchandra Shastri (ed.): *Ācārya Pūjyapāda's Sarvārthasiddhi [The commentary on Ācārya Griddhāpichha's Tattvārtha-sūtra]*. Edited and translated [into Hindi]. Varanasi 1934 [reprinted: MJG 13, D 2000]. (2) Jinadasa Śāstri (ed.): *Tattvārtha-vṛttiḥ Sarvārtha-siddhiḥ—Pūjyapāda Devanandin*. Śrīsekharāma Nemicandra Granthāmālā 128, Devajī Sakhārām Diśī & Māṇikacandra-digambara-jaina-parikṣālaya-mantri, Śoḍaśapur 1939.
- Steinkellner 1991 = Steinkellner, Ernst: 'Apropos of Lindtner's Two New Works of Dharmakīrti,' in Debabrata Sen Sharma; Manabendu Banerjee (eds.): *Prajñāyoti: Prof. Dr. Gopikamahon Bhattacharya Commemoration Volume*. Nirmal Book Agency, Kurukshetra 1991: 277–286.
- Steinkellner 2005 = Steinkellner, Ernst: *Dignāga's Pramānasamuccaya, Chapter 1. A hypothetical reconstruction of the Sanskrit text with the help of the two Tibetan translations on the basis of the hitherto known Sanskrit fragments and the linguistic materials gained from Jinendrabuddhi's Tīkā*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2005 (April). <www.oeaw.ac.at/ias/Mat/dignaga_PS_1.pdf>.
- Steinkellner–Much 1995 = Steinkellner, Ernst; Much, Michael Torsten: *Texte der erkenntnistheoretischen Schule des Buddhismus—Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur II*, Abhandlungen der Akademie Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge Nr. 214, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1995.
- STP = Siddhasena Divākara: *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇa*. (1) Sukhlāl Saṅghavi; Becardās Dośī (ed.): *Sammatitarka-prakaraṇam by Siddhasena Divākara with Abhayadevasūri's Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī*. *Gujarāt-purā-tattva-mandir-granthāvalī* 10, 16, 18, 19, 21, Gujarāt-purā-tattva-mandir, Amdāvād 1924–1931 [reprinted: 2 Vols., *Rinsen Buddhist Text Series* VI–1, 2; Kyoto 1984].
- StVi = Samantabhadra: *Stuti-vidyā*. Pannālāl Jain (ed., Hindi transl.); Jugal Kīśor Mukhtār 'Yugavīra' (Introduction): *Śrīmat-svāmi-Samantabhadrācārya-viracitā Stuti-vidyā (Jina-śataka) [Samantabhadra-bhāratiḥ eka aṅga] śrī-Vasunandy-ācārya-kṛta samskṛta-tīkāse alaṅkṛta tathā hindīanuvāda se yukta*. Cīra-sevā-mandir, Sarasāvā Jilā Sahāranpur 1950.
- StViṭ = *Stuti-vidyā-tīkā*. See StVi.
- SvSt = Samantabhadra (?): *Svayambhū-stotra*. (1) Jugal Kīśor Mukhtār 'Yugavīra' (ed., introd.): *Śrīmat-svāmi-Samantabhadrācārya-viracita catur-viṃśati-jina-stavanātmaka Svayambhū-stotra (stuti-pāraka jāināgama)*. *Vīra-sevā-mandira-grantha-mālā* 7, Vīra-sevā Mandira, Sarasāvā Jilā Sahāranapura 1951. (2) Pannālāl Jain (ed.): *Ācārya samantabhadra viracita Svayambhū-stotra [Samskṛta-tīkā śrī Prabhācandrācārya]*. 2 ed., Bhāratavarsīya Anekānta Vidvat Paṛiṣad Puṣpa Saṃkhyā 31, Bhāratavarsīya Anekānta Vidvat Paṛiṣad, Vārāṇasī 1995. (3) Devendra K. Goyal (ed., tr.): *The Path to Enlightenment. Svayambhu Stotra by Acharya Samantabhadra Svami. English Translation with introduction*. Radiant Publishers, New Delhi 2000.
- TBV = Abhayadeva-sūri: *Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī*. See: STP.
- Tillemans 2000 = Tillemans, Tom J.F.: *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. An Annotated Translation of the Fourth Chapter (parārthānumāna)*. Volume 1 (k. 1–148). Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2000.
- Tsa = Śāntarakṣita / Kamalaśīla: *Tattva-saṅgraha*. (1) Embar Krishnamacharya (ed.): *Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the commentary of Kamalaśīla*. 2 Vols., Gaekwad's Oriental Series 30–31, Oriental Institute, Baroda 1926 [reprinted: 1984, 1988]. (2) Dvarikadas Shastri (ed.): *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Śāntarakṣita with the Commentary 'Pañjikā' of Shri Kamalashīla*. 2 Vols. Bauddha Bharatī Series 1, Bauddha Bharatī, Vārāṇasī 1981–1982.
- TsaP = Kamalaśīla: *Tattva-saṅgraha-pañjikā*. See: Tsa.
- TT = Siddhasena-gaṇin (Gandhāstīn): *Tattvārthādhigama-tīkā*. Hīrālāl Rasikdās Kapadia (ed.): *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra (A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Jainism) by His Holiness Śrī Umāsvāmi Vāchaka, together with His connective verses commented upon by Śrī Devaguptasūri & Śrī Siddhasenagaṇin and His own gloss elucidated by Śrī Siddhasenagaṇin, edited with Introduction in English and Sanskrit*. 2 Vols., Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakodhar Fund Series Nos. 67 and 76, Jivanachand Sakerchand Javerī, Bombay 1926 (Part I: Chapters I–V), 1930 (Part II: Chapters VI–X).
- Upadhye 1971 = Upadhye, A.N. (ed.): *Siddhasena Divākara's Nyāyavātāra (edited by the late S.C. Vidyabhusan with English Translation, Notes etc.) and with the Vivṛti of Siddharṣi as well as The Text of 21 Dvātrīṃśikās and the Sammaī-suttam; Vinayavijaya's Nayakarṇikā*, edited by... with an Introduction, Bibliographic Review, Indices etc. Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Maṅḍala, Bombay 1971.

- Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1909 = Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Satis Chandra: *History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*. University Studies 1, Calcutta University, Calcutta 1909. [reprinted: Oriental Books Reprint Corp., Delhi 1977].
- Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1920 = Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Satish Chandra: *A History of Indian Logic (Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Schools)*. Calcutta 1920 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1988].
- Wiley 2004 = Wiley, Kristi L.: *Historical Dictionary of Jainism*. Scarecrow Press, Lanham, Maryland 2004.
- Wiley 2006 = Wiley, Kristi L.: *The A to Z of Jainism*. Vision Books, New Delhi–Mumbai–Hyderabad 2006.
- Williams 1963 = Williams, Robert: *Jaina Yoga*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1963 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1983].
- Winternitz 1987 = Winternitz, Moritz: *A History of Indian Literature*. Vols., I–II, Calcutta 1927–33; Vol. III, 1–2: Calcutta 1963–1967 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1987].
- YA = Samantabhadra: *Yukty-anuśāsana*. Indra Lāl: (ed.): *Śrīmat-samantabhadrācārya-praṇītaṃ Yukty-anuśāsanaṃ. Śrī-vidyānandācārya-viracitayā ṭīkāyā saṃvantaṃ*. Māṇikacandra-Digambara-Jaina-Grantha-mālā, Nāthūrām Premī Maṃtrī / Māṇikacandra-Digambara-Jaina-Grantha-mālā-samīti, Bombay 1921 (Saṃ.: 1977).
- YAṬ = Vidyānanda Pātrakesarisvāmin: *Yukty-anuśāsana-ṭīkā*. See: YA.