Original Research Article

Qualified non-convergence: critical comparison of Jain Anekāntavāda and Derridean Deconstruction

Bipasha Joardar

Assistant Professor, Rishi Bankim Chandra College for Women, Email: joardar.bipasha12@gmail.com

Abstract:
The purpose of this paper is to find the underlying relation between the Jain doctrine of Anekāntavāda (non-one-sideness or many-sideness) and Jacques Derrida's epoch making theory of Deconstruction. Apart from exploring the very core of Anekāntavāda, with its allied doctrines of 'Naya'(standpoints) and 'Syādvāda' or 'Saptabhangī', the paper also explores the pivotal ideas of Deconstruction, as critique of the metaphysics of presence, différance, textual inerrability and the binary nature of reversal and displacement. Both the schools of philosophy share a pluralistic, anti-absolutist stand in their critique of one-sided truth claims. Still, after a deep philosophical analysis the deep incompatibility in their fundamentality can be found. This paper investigates and tries to demonstrate that Anekāntavāda operates as an epistemological and ontological framework with a clear teleological aim to attain a singular, knowable and absolute truth. On the contrary, Derridean Deconstruction is an anti-foundationalist critique which differs from the idea of arriving any singular or absolute meaning. It rather operates as a process without a constructive conclusion of meaning. Both the theories question the very idea of one absolute truth, yet they do it in a very different way. The core purpose of this paper is to recognize those differences and explore that how Derrida's deconstruction and Jaina Anekāntavāda each offer distinct yet profound ways of understanding truth and meaning and how unique it is that two different theories form two different culture and timelines can be fundamentally similar in the purpose of seeking truth and meaning.

Keywords:
Anekāntavāda, Naya, Syādvāda, Saptabhangī, Deconstruction, Différance

Introduction: Framing the Comparative Inquiry

It is unique that if we make the ancient Indian Philosophy encounter the late 20th Century Western thought, there will be ample scope for comparative analysis. The doctrine of Jain 'Anekāntavāda' is a foundational pillar of an ancient religious tradition. On the other hand, Jacques Derrida's Theory of Deconstruction is a post-modern idea of post-structuralism. We will compare Jacques Derrida's theory of deconstruction and 'Anekāntavāda' in the light of their acceptance of multiplicity and critique of one-sided truth claims. Though they are separated by over two millennia, and belongs to very different cultural context, their philosophical approaches show remarkable similarity in their criticism of absolute truth claims and rigid conceptual frameworks. Beneath their differences, they share the same goal of questioning the absolute truth and accepting multiple view points as important for understanding meaning.

'Anekāntavāda', literally meaning "non-one-sidedness", emerged as a core principle of Jain Philosophy. It represents the doctrine of multiple perspectives and the relativity of truth. This ancient Indian philosophical position which is attributed to Mahāvīra (599-527 BCE) and earlier Tīrthankaras, hols the belief that reality depicts infinite characteristics and it can't be comprehensively achieved from any single perspective.

In true sense, Anekāntavāda provides a structured epistemological method to comprehend a complex reality and the ultimate goal is to achieve an absolute, unconditioned understanding. On the other hand, Derrida's deconstruction emerged and developed in the mid-twentieth century and it was critical response to Western philosophy's "metaphysics of presence". This post- structuralist approach carefully uncovers and challenges the very base of Western Philosophy. In simple terms, deconstruction is a theory which rejects any absolute fixed truth or final meaning. It other words, it shows that meaning is ever changing and can never be absolute, final or completely certain.

This paper's pivotal argument centers around the idea that Jain Anekāntavāda provides us a structured framework for understanding a complex, multi layered, multi sided reality and the ultimate goal is to attain a total, knowable truth 'Kevala Jñāna'. On the other side, Derridean deconstruction is a non-teleological, anti-foundationalism critique that rejects the idea of any singular or absolute meaning. This basic difference in their structure and purpose makes them impossible to fully compare. Though, it creates a strong foundation for a clear, discussion worthy argument. We will first explain each philosophy in detail. Afterwards, they will be compared to find out their unique and shared aspects.

The Jain Doctrine of Anekāntavāda: An Epistemological and Ontological Framework

Anekāntavāda is one of the most important ideas in Jainism. The word comes from Sanskrit and means "doctrine of many-sidedness" or "non-one-sidedness." It teaches us

that every object or truth has many sides. No single statement or view can explain the absolute truth. The Jain thinkers believe that everything in the world has many aspects that might exist together.

They say that every real thing is called '*dravya'* and it has substance and qualities, known as '*guṇa.*' These stay the same, but its forms or modes, called '*paryāya'*, always keep changing. So, logically a thing is both permanent and changing at the same time. When we speak about anything, we can only describe one part or one side of it. Because of that, every statement is true only from a certain point of view only.

Anekāntavāda goes against rigid, one-sided thinking and blind relativism. It accepts that truth is a complex and infinite idea. There are countless ways to understand the reality. No single person, belief, or statement can capture the full essence of truth. Human knowledge is always limited, biased and partial and that is the reason we can only see one aspect of truth at a time.

The famous story of the blind men and the elephant clearly shows the idea of Anekāntavāda. In the story, several blind men are asked to touch different parts of an elephant. One touches the trunk and says the elephant is like a snake. Another touches the leg and says it is like a tree. A third touches the tail and says it is like a rope. Each man is partly right, but none of them understands the whole idea of elephant.

This story teaches us that every point of view has some truth in it, but it is still incomplete. Anekāntavāda tells us that real understanding comes only when we accept and combine multiple different viewpoints. Only then can we come closer to explore the full truth or reality.

Anekāntavāda is not a standalone concept. It is elaborated through two related ideas: **Nayavāda** and **Syādvāda**. **Nayavāda** means the theory of partial viewpoints. It is a way of understanding knowledge. It says that all human knowledge comes from limited views. There are many ways to look at one thing. Each way is correct but not complete. For example, one person can be seen as a "human being" (a general view) or as "my grandmother" (a personal view). Both are true, but only partly.

Syādvāda is the rule for saying these partial truths. It uses the word **'syāt'** in every sentence. This word does not mean "maybe" or "perhaps". It means "from a certain view" or "in a certain way". It reminds us that the statement is true only in one context. Still other views may also be true at the same time.

Syādvāda uses **seven ways** to express truth. This is called **Saptabhangī**. These seven ways are:

1. **Syād-asti** – From one view, it is.
2. **Syād-nāsti** – From one view, it is not.
3. **Syād-asti-nāsti** – From one view, it is and is not.
4. **Syād-avaktavyaḥ** – From one view, it cannot be described.
5. **Syād-asti-avaktavyaḥ** – From one view, it is and cannot be described.

6. **Syād-nāsti-avaktavyaḥ** – From one view, it is not and cannot be described.
7. **Syād-asti-nāsti-avaktavyaḥ** – From one view, it is, is not, and cannot be described.

Nayavāda works with **Syādvāda**. It gives seven clear ways to look at reality. Each way shows only a part of the truth. These views go from general to specific. To fully understand something, we must join all the views together.

Anekāntavāda is not just about knowledge. It also helps in solving deep problems in philosophy. One such problem is the '**paradox of causality**.' This asks: how can something be made if it did not exist before?

Jain thinkers used Anekāntavāda to answer this. They said a pot is made from clay. So, it is "already made" in the form of clay. But its shape is new, so it is "not yet made". Both are true at the same time. This shows Anekāntavāda is not just about saying everything is relative. It is a smart way to solve hard logical problems in a world with innumerable truths.

A deep understanding shows that **Anekāntavāda** is not the final goal. It is a tool to reach an ultimate goal, i.e. **Kevala Jñāna**, or full knowledge. The story of the blind men and the elephant shows this. Each man touches a part of the elephant and gives a different answer. But the full elephant exists. Only a pure soul, free from karma, can know the whole truth.

Today, people often say Anekāntavāda means peace in thinking or religious tolerance. But in history, it was not so soft. It was a strong tool used in debates. It helped defend Jain ideas and even challenged others. It did not say all ideas are equal. It gave a clear and strong way to understand truth. It is not a mere combination of of many views. It is a well-built system of thought. It helps us perceive reality and protect one clear view.

The Project of Deconstruction: A Critique of Western Metaphysics

Deconstruction is a post-modern idea in philosophy and literature. It was started by **Jacques Derrida** in the late 20th century. It questions the very basic ideas of **Western Metaphysics**. Derrida's main focus was **logocentrism**. This means Western thought gives importance to one fixed origin, a stable presence, and a direct link between words and reality. This idea comes from **Greek philosophy**, especially from **Plato**. It says speech is better than writing. Speech is seen as pure and direct. Writing is seen as secondary and inferior in truth. **Deconstruction** tries to break these pairs—like speech/writing, presence/absence, good/evil. It shows that these pairs are not stable. They depend on each other and are never fixed.

A key idea in deconstruction is **'différance'**. Derrida coined this word by mixing two French verbs: "to differ" and "to defer". It means that meaning is never complete or present all at once. Meaning comes from 'differences' between words and is always 'delayed.' For example, the word **"tree"** means what it is **not**—not a bush, not a leaf, not

a branch. This is what Derrida calls '**difference**.' We understand "tree" only in the context of other words. Even then, the exact concept shifts depending on who is interpreting it. This is what Derrida argues as '**deferral**.' So, meaning is never fully present in the word itself, it is always deferred and rational. Derrida further argues that the meaning or a word is never fully accessible in the present. This goes against the idea that meaning is fixed and outside language.

Derrida's famous line **"there is nothing outside the text"** (*il n'y a pas de hors-texte*) does not mean that only words exist. While saying so, he actually meant **"nothing outside context"**. Derrida meant that all human experiences of this world is filtered through language and signs. So, reality is like a 'text' that can be read and interpreted in many ways.

The main doctrine of Deconstruction is against fixed "foundations of knowledge". It questions the very idea of certainty and introduces a world of "radical uncertainty". It does not try to build a new system. It has neither any final goal or destination nor does it seek a complete truth. Its only aim is to show contradictions in ideas. It reveals how texts go against their own claims and shows that meanings are never fully stable.

Deconstruction does not try to build a new system. It does not aim for a final truth. It keeps showing how texts break their own claims. It brings out contradictions and shows that meaning is never stable. Some people say deconstruction leads to **relativism or nihilism**. But others argue that it has **ethical value** as well. It questions unfair ideas in Western thought. It also asks us to rethink how we treat animals and others. Anekāntavāda is linked to **ethics** like **Ahiṁsā** and the path to **spiritual freedom**. But deconstruction's ethics come from its critical work. It does not aim to be ethical. Its ethical side is a result of breaking down fixed ideas.

Points of Convergence: The Superficial Similarities

Anekāntavāda and deconstruction both question the very idea of one absolute truth. They believe truth is complex and can't be captured by just one single viewpoint. For deconstruction truth is ever changing and for Anekāntavāda truth differs for different perspectives. Anekāntavāda says no single statement can fully describe reality. Only someone who is all-knowing can see the whole truth. Deconstruction, from Derrida, also doubts fixed meanings. It says meaning keeps changing and can't be pinned down. Both reject rigid thinking. They support openness and multiple perspectives.

Anekāntavāda talks about "many-sidedness." It uses logic (Syādvāda) and viewpoints (Nayavāda) to show that reality has multiple angles. Deconstruction also supports multiple meanings. It sees 'texts' as full of shifting interpretations, not one clear and absolute message. But both the doctrines reach this idea of plurality in different ways. Anekāntavāda builds it through a system of logic and a belief in a real, complex, world.

Deconstruction gets there by breaking down the idea of any solid foundation by showing that meaning is ever changing.

Furthermore, both system also see limits in language. Anekāntavāda accepts human attempts at communication as 'naya', or a "partial expression of the truth." They believe reality cannot be totally expressed with language. Derrida says meaning in language is never complete, it's always delayed or different. These ideas help fight the dogma. Anekāntavāda promotes tolerance and calls this "intellectual non-violence." It helps avoid fanaticism. Deconstruction also challenges fixed beliefs by encouraging constant questioning and resists simple answers.

The similarities of both the theories are more about words than deeper structure. Both of the doctrines use terms like "pluralism," "non-absolutism," and "critique," yet they reach these ideas in a very different way. Anekāntavāda sees plurality through clear systems of logic (Syādvāda) and viewpoints (Nayavāda) and this based on a real, complex metaphysical world. Deconstruction on the other hand, finds plurality by rejecting the idea that there is no fixed foundation and shows that meaning is always unstable.

Teleology: The Path to Total Truth vs. Perpetual Deferral

The deepest difference is in the ultimate purpose or 'telos' of the respective philosophies. Anekāntavāda is a doctrine with a clear, definitive end, that is the attainment of 'Kevala Jñāna (omniscience)'. The entire structure of its doctrine serves as a means to achieve this complete, unconditioned, all-encompassing knowledge of reality. The parable of the blind men and the elephant is not a celebration of eternal ignorance; rather, it guides one who aspires to become the "omniscient being" capable of seeing all sides and perspectives—hence, an elephant's "full picture." It becomes a philosophy based on accumulation and synthesis wherein partial truths converge toward approximating total truth. The Jain tradition believes firmly that such total truth does exist and can be reached through an organized spiritual as well as intellectual pursuit.

Deconstruction is, in contrast, a process that has no 'telos'. It does not aspire to the coming of a final meaning, total truth, or definitive understanding but rather constantly critiques and defers such an arrival by showing that truth is always "deferred and differs". There is never any possibility of arriving at a "full picture"; there is only the interminable, undecidable play of signification within an infinitely mobile field of language and concepts. The deconstructive project is one of endless dismantling and critique rather than synthesis and construction.

Foundationalism: Metaphysical Structure vs. Anti-Metaphysical Critique

Anekāntavāda is committed to a foundationalist metaphysics and does not entertain any possibility of compromise. It is non-absolutist in epistemology but not anti-foundationalist

in ontology. Jainism presents a basic duality of reality as 'jiva (soul)' and 'ajiva (non-soul)'; therefore, Anekāntavāda serves merely to interpret this already structured, existing reality. The task of the doctrine is to protect a certain vision from challenges, secure the continuity of an essential religious identity, and not to raise any question about the very existence of a metaphysical foundation.

Deconstruction is an anti-foundationalist project by its very definition as it intends to dismantle the structures of Western metaphysics and the "foundations of knowledge" on which they rest. It wishes to reveal that these structures are riddled with "inherent contradictions" and built on unstable grounds. Deconstruction does not work within some given metaphysical reality; it works against the grain, against any idea of stable, transcendental, or self-present reality that could provide an anchorage for meaning or truth.

The Nature of Truth and Language

The different teleologies and relationships to foundationalism are also reflected in the respective understandings of truth and language. Anekāntavāda considers statements as "partial expressions of the truth" and validates them "in some respect." The aim here is to synthesize these partial truths into one more comprehensive, though still conditional, understanding. This is a constructive, unifying approach that aspires toward a higher, fuller truth.

For Derrida, meaning is not "partial" in the Jain sense of being part of a larger puzzle; rather, it is inherently unstable and always "in process." Meaning results from the play of language and is already contaminated by the difference and deferral that constitute it. This view is de-constructive and disseminating: it does not seek unification or reconciliation but, instead, aims at revealing fissures and contradictions within a text.

This project difference—one being a synthesis philosophy while another becomes a dissemination philosophy—is indeed their incommensurability center. The Anekāntavāda framework attempts an intellectual synthesis among contradictory views toward achieving some coherent comprehensive "higher truth"; however, Derrida's deconstruction exposes instability with internal contradiction whereby meaning remains perpetually dispersed and fluid.

Philosophical Implications and Examples:

Example 1: The Jar Analysis

The pot is a standard illustration of Jaina Anekāntavāda. It may be characterized as clay, as a vessel, as round, or as beautiful. Each description represents one particular aspect of the reality of the pot, yet none can give a full account of what the pot is in its entirety.

The pot analogy illustrates the Jaina view that reality consists of many dimensions and aspects which can only be understood if we accept different perspectives rather than clinging to one absolute view of reality. Derrida's deconstruction also insists that no text can ever be reduced to one single fixed meaning. For example, in his reading of Rousseau in Of Grammatology, he shows how writing - traditionally considered derivative and inferior to speech - actually undermines the hierarchical structures that sustain logocentrism. Rousseau's philosophy is at the center of logocentrism since it clearly prefers the natural voice over writing, which he sees as a dangerous supplement or drug that corrupts presence.

Derrida argues against this hierarchy maintained by Rousseau. In discussing language origins, Rousseau often describes speech with metaphors he uses for writing. More importantly, Rousseau finds that even speech, which is thought to be pure and direct, already implies a need for its supplement (such as writing) to exist, indicating that true "presence" in the voice was never there in the first place.

This move shows that writing is not secondary but rather primary—the original condition of possibility—what Derrida calls arche-writing. By demonstrating how Rousseau's own text depends on and contradicts the logic of a term he wishes to dismiss, Derrida exposes instability within the speech/writing binary oppositions and proves that this text cannot be reduced to the single fixed meaning "speech is superior." The text thus gets deconstructed from inside out! Meaning therefore always defers to another context and remains open for reinterpretation.

The shared premise between the two is their resistance to absolutism. Anekāntavāda insists on the need for many perspectives to get at the truth, while deconstruction reveals the unsteadiness of meaning and the impossibility of one final reading. Jain philosophy seeks a teleological realization of truth, and Derrida speaks of endless textual play without closure, yet they meet in spirit: reality, be it metaphysical or textual, is plural and relational and cannot be fully understood from any one position.

Example 2: Speech and Writing

Derrida's deconstruction of the hierarchy between speech and writing in Plato shows methodological similarities with Anekāntavāda's theory of conditional predication. Where Plato gives priority to speech as immediate and present over writing which he sees as derivative, Derrida demonstrates that even speech operates like writing by relying on differential signs that must be repeatable for meaning.

Anekāntavāda would take up this question through Syātvāda, perhaps saying: maybe speech is primary (from the view of temporal immediacy), maybe writing is primary (from the view of preservation and dissemination), maybe both are primary (from different standpoints at once), maybe neither one is primary (from the perspective of their mutual dependence). This qualified approach happens to be exactly what deconstruction reveals about seemingly opposed terms: their mutual dependence.

Example 3: Truth and Interpretation

The two traditions define truth in relation to interpretation in almost identical terms. Anekāntavāda's Nayavāda states that truth can be seen from different angles like universal, particular, practical, linear, verbal, etymological and actual. No one view can capture all aspects of truth; therefore, it requires multiple perspectives to get a complete picture.

Derrida's method of approaching meaning also emphasizes hermeneutical complexity. His notion of différance indicates that meaning is never fully determined since every interpretation opens up new avenues for understanding while postponing final resolution. Hence both traditions offer highly developed hermeneutical frameworks that resist any form of interpretive dogmatism.

Academic Significance and Research Potential

The relationship between Anekāntavāda and Derrida's deconstruction illustrates how two different traditions engage with similar concerns about knowledge, truth, and understanding. Both resist reductive, binary thinking, oppose dogma, and advocate for multiplicity and contextuality. Anekāntavāda encourages seeing things from multiple angles, while deconstruction reveals the play of meaning and the deferral of presence. Together, they offer resources for thinking about how to embrace pluralism without slipping into total relativism. Though finding parallels between them can help to question the assumption that Eastern and Western philosophies should be understood as separate traditions, their differences are significant. For instance, deconstruction might be used to explore the protean nature of Jain philosophy, while Anekāntavāda might inspire deconstructive readings of religious texts.

Anekāntavāda's commitment to ahimsā might guide a postmodern ethics that takes seriously the critiques of power and hierarchy that are found in deconstruction. On the other hand, Anekāntavāda's emphasis on interdependence and relationality might inform political theory and eco-theology in ways that resist both totalizing discourses and radical fragmentation. Both suggest ways to think about how to navigate the space between plurality and unity, ambiguity and clarity, or moral responsibility without falling into dogmatism on one side or nihilism on the other. The dialogue between East and West shows not only how cross-cultural philosophy can bear fruit in new ways but also how it can address contemporary intellectual and social challenges.

Conclusion: A Qualified Non-Convergence

In sum, this comparative study of Anekāntavāda and deconstruction brings out both the promise and the limits of cross-cultural philosophical exchange. At the outset, their emphasis on plurality, anti-absolutism, and critique of binary oppositions seems to invite a

non-reductive convergence. Anekāntavāda offers a way of accessing reality through multiple viewpoints or perspectives, while deconstruction works against any stable center or presence by exposing the play of différance at work in any system of meaning or authority. However, upon closer examination, these similarities remain largely formal or superficial.

Anekāntavāda is essentially constructive, bringing together partial truths into a totality that leads to spiritual knowledge and liberation. Its pluralism has a goal, that is, to synthesize multiplicity into clarity and understanding. In effect, deconstruction is purely critical and anti-foundational; it never accepts synthesis but continuously questions the instability of language, meaning, and truth to show the impossibility of any stable overarching metaphysical system. One moves toward truth while the other dismantles the very possibility of any ultimate reality.

The differences are large in their implications for comparative philosophy by warning against easy equations and emphasizing the need to engage each tradition on its own terms—not just recognizing surface similarities but also deep structural, epistemic, and teleological differences that define them. Such a study has value not in claiming equivalence at all but rather in showing how two radically different tracks of thought illuminate complementary sides of human inquiry: one toward integration with ethical coherence and the other toward critical vigilance with interpretive openness.

In brief, the conversation between Anekāntavāda and deconstruction is an example of how important thoughtful cross-cultural philosophical inquiry really is. True understanding doesn't come from forcing alignment or looking for superficial parallels; it comes from recognizing and respecting distinct trajectories, aims, and insights among different traditions. Anekāntavāda instructs us about disciplined perspective integration toward truth and liberation while deconstruction forces us to face the instability and contingency of meaning itself. They together challenge scholars to think rigorously yet openly, providing a vision of philosophy that is both constructively engaged as well as critically vigilant—the kind capable of dealing with complexities, welcoming ambiguities, addressing ethical issues along with epistemic plus existential challenges in our interconnected world! This synthesis does not yield contradiction but rather offers what can be termed the richest possible terrain for intellectual discovery.

References

1. Bagchi, Dipak Kumar. *Bharatiya Darshan*. Kolkata: Pragatishil Prakashak, 1997.
2. Bandyapadhyay, Shyamali. *Jaina Darshan Sammyata Jñātatva- Ekti Samikkha*. Kolkata: Avenel Press, 2016.
3. Bhattacharya, Harimohan. *Jaina Logic and Epistemology*. Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi & Company, 1994.
4. Chakravarti, Dr. Niradbaran. *Bharatiya Darshan.* Kolkata: Dutta Publishers, 1997.
5. Chatterjee, A.K. *A Comprehensive History of Jainism*. Kolkata: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1978.

6.   Chatterjee, S.C. and Dutta, D.M. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1968.

7.   Culler, Jonathan D. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

8.   Dasgupta, S.N. *History of Indian Philosophy*. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.

9.   Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: The Structuralist Controversy*, edited by Richard A. Macksey and Eugenio Donato, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970.

10.   Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978, 278–93.

11.   Derrida, Jacques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1967.

12.   Derrida, Jacques. *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

13.   Derrida, Jacques. *Margins of Philosophy.* Trans. and notes, by Alan Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

14.   Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology.* Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

15.   Derrida, Jacques. *Speech and Phenomena; and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs.* Translated by David B. Allison, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

16.   Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

17.   Deutscher, Max. *"Il n'y a pas de hors-texte — Once More."* Symposium: Canadian Journal of Continental Philosophy 18.2 (2014): 98–124.

18.   Mukherjee, Dr. Satkori. *The Jaina Philosophy of Non-Absolutism (A Critical Study of Anekantavada*). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978

19.   Potter, Karl H. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy*. Volume. I & III. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983

20.   Radhakrishnan, S. *Indian Philosophy*. Volume.2. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1927.

21.   Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1960

22.   Sinha, K.P. *The Philosophy of Jainism*. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1990