



MAŁGORZTA GLINICKA
UNIwersytet Warszawski

LANGUAGE DYNAMICS IN THE CASE OF AN OMNISCIENT IN THE JAIN LITERATURE OF CLASSICAL PERIOD (5th–10th c. CE)

In the following article I would like to discuss a crucial and recurrent issue of the Jain philosophy of classical period (5th–10th c. CE): the relation between language and omniscience, and to find an answer to a question: how is it possible for a person, who is omniscient (cf. *ājñā*, *ayogikevali*, *sayogikevali* etc.), i.e. one who possesses omniscience (*kevala*), to create a linguistic image of reality, since they have lost dependency on karmic matter, and in consequence on whole materiality? Do we face a paradox or is it a logical consequence of Jain philosophical presumptions?

Relation between the Self and Matter in the Light of Language Materiality

Although the language – according to the Jain philosophy – is a mode of matter, it is connected strictly with living beings and their mutual relations¹. It is described in *Tattvârtha-sûtra* (“The Treatise on Reals”) [TS] by Umasvâti (4th/5th) in the following way:

¹ Karl H. Potter, describing complexity of this relations, realises: “[...] the Jain thinks of the *jīvas* as swimming around in a suspension of particles of *ajīva*. When some of these particles attach themselves to a *jīva*, the *jīva* is said to be bound – but so, from another point of view, are the particles of *ajīva*. Now the particles are not related by a dependence relation to the *jīva*; *ajīva* and *jīva* are quite different in nature. But the *ajīva* which constitutes bondage depends on the nonbinding *ajīva* as its substratum, just as the *jīva* which is bound depends on the unbound *jīva* as its substratum. Freedom is possible just because it is possible for the binding *ajīva* to be destroyed without destroying the nonbinding *ajīva*, and (more importantly) because it is possible for the bound *jīva* to be destroyed without destroying the unbound *jīva*. Both

parasparôpagraho jivānām².

“Living beings assists each other”.

Viyāhapannatti [ViP], the fifth part (*aṃga*) of the Jaina canon, also presents the interrelatedness between matter and soul, a compelling motive present in Jaina literature of all phases, important especially in the context of conscious reception and usage of written words and sounds:

“The soul (*jīva*) is *poggali* scil. possesses atoms of matter, namely in the senses, as well as *poggala*, i.e. individual”³.

Akalaṅka (8th c. CE), together with other representatives of Jain thought, ascribes preoccupation concerning language to human being⁴, that is why it is impossible to disjoin *śabda* and human consciousness. The author of RVār signalizes that cognitive ability is limited by knowledge veiling karman, treated as a kind of karman which causes obfuscation of knowledge and has its innumerable secondary configurations. This characteristic blackout affects all kinds of mental activity, including all linguistic operations. We read in RVār, that among material constituents covering knowledge (*jñānâvaraṇa-mūla-prakṛteḥ*), i. e. varieties of karman, there are such of secondary (*pañcôttara-prakṛtayaḥ*) and tertiary (*uttarôttarāḥ*) nature, that are of peculiar kind (*prakṛti-viśeṣāḥ*)⁵.

the *jīva* and the *ajīva* become free [...]” [Potter 1991, 146]. Nathmal Tatia enunciates: “There is no bondage without the inter-relation of spirit and matter, and there is no inter-relation of spirit and matter without the bondage” [Tatia 2006, 225].

² TS V. 23.

³ ViP 423b, p. 158.

⁴ RVār I. 15. 1-5.

⁵ RVār I. 15. 13. Topic of *mūla-prakṛti* has been undertaken in: Zaveri 1992, p. 121; Flügel 2006, p. 440; Tater 2009, pp. Xxx, 56, 69. Cf. Akalaṅka stresses in RVār II. 6. 5. that in some humans and all five-sensed animals, in spite of a parrot and a *maina* bird (*pañcêndriya-tiryakṣu śuka-sārikâdi-varjiteṣu manuṣyeṣu*), as he explains, there are particles responsible for veiling syllabic linguistic knowledge (*akṣara-śrutâvaraṇasya*) because of the rise of all-yielding destructing factor (*sarva-dhâtispardhakasyôdayād*) [Cf. Muni 1998, 198–200].

Matter as an Attendant of the Non-material

The Jain thinkers underline that there is a mutual relationship between matter and the living being. AP mentions that they are of twenty one kinds (*jīva-pudgalayoḥ eka-viṃśatī*)⁶. The relation between matter and the soul is clearly explained in *Dravya-saṃgraha* (“The Compendium of Substance”) [DS] by Nemichandra (10th c. CE), according to which matter belongs to the group which is not the self⁷. B. J. Bhaskar explains that the soul and matter “stand towards each other in relationship of phenomenal conjunction” [Bhaskar 1972, 73]. However, the most interesting concept concerning their mutual contacts, from my point of view, is that which considers matter as an attendant of the self, which has been explained in GS⁸:

jīvādoṇaṃtaguṇā paḍiparamāṇum hi vissasovacayā. jīveṇa ya samavedā ekkakkamṃ podi samāṇā hu⁹.

jīva to'nantaguṇā pratiparamāṇau visrasopacayāḥ. jīvenā ca samavetā ekaikamṃ prati samāṇā hi.

“With every atom (Paramaṇu of Karmic and quasi-Karmic matter which binds the soul there are) naturally attendant (Visrasopa-chaya atoms of the same kind; and their number is) infinite times the number of souls (liberated and mundane). (The naturally attendant atoms) also coexist with each atom (of Karmic and quasi-Karmic matter which binds) the soul. Each atom of (Karmic and Quasi-Karmic matter) has an equal number of naturally attendant atoms”.

We can observe here a concept of atomic structural tiers connected with each other and with the soul. The first tier consists of atoms (*paramaṇu*) firmly attached to the soul. The second tier is a collection of atoms attending (*vistasôpacaya*)¹⁰ to it.

P. S. Jaini comments on this issue in the following way:

⁶ AP 29.

⁷ DS 15: ajjīvo puṇa ñeo puggaladhammo adhamma āyāsaṃ. kālo puggalamutto rūvādiguṇo amutti sesā du.

⁸ All quotations and translations on the basis of *The Sacred Books of the Jainas. Gommatasara Jīva-kāṇḍa*, Rai Bahadur J. L. Jaini, Pandit Ajit Prasada, The Central Jaina Publishing House Ajitashram, Lucknow 1927.

⁹ DS 249.

¹⁰ This category of *visrasopa-chaya* atoms has appeared in [Jain 2003].

“Matter (*puḍgala*) renders «service» to the *jīva*, first by transforming itself into this «karmic» matter and then into body, vital life (*prāṇa*), sense organs, speech and the physical basis of mind (*dravya-manas*). [...] It should be noted, however, that this «assistance» has strictly the nature of instrumentality (*nimitta-kāraṇa*); it is not nearby so vital as its counterpart, the operative or material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*). Being a «material» cause is the prerogative of the substance alone; that is, the substance (*dravya*) in one mode (*paryāya*) is the material «cause» of the substance in its subsequent mode, which is thus its «effect». There can be neither an addition to nor a substratum from this innate power of the substance, the power to modify itself in accordance with its potential or «*upādāna*» – regardless of the presence or absence of instrumental (*nimitta*) causes. The Jaina therefore maintains that when the matter cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*) is present, instrumental causes (*nimitta-kāraṇas*) will automatically appear [...]” [Jaini 2000, 48].

Jaini pays attention to a very important aspect of this attendancy – its entanglement with the theory of karman and peculiar cause and effect order. As RVār indicates – referring to the process of pot’s production – that to complete an action material (*upādāna*) and efficient (*nimitta*) causes are necessary¹¹. This mutual concomitance is stressed in *Laghu-tattva-sphoṭa* (“A Light Bursting of the Reality”) [LTS]¹², *Tattvārtha-śloka-vārttika* (“A Drop of the Supreme Self”) [ŚVār] by Vidyānanda (9th c. CE)¹³, as well as in *Adhyātma-bindu* (“A Commentary to *Tattvārtha-sūtra* [written] in Ślokas”) [AB] by Harṣavardhana Gaṇi (15th c. CE)¹⁴.

To illuminate the problem of cause and effect order, I would like to refer to Hemacandra, the thinker of the later period (12th c. CE), who, undertaking reflection on causality law, in *Pramāṇa-mīmāṃsā* (“The Examination of *Pramāṇas*”) claims that:

pūrvôttarâkâra-parihâra-svikâra-sthiti-lakṣaṇa-pariṇâmenâsyârtha-kriyôpapattiḥ¹⁵.

“The evidence of causal activity of that object (possessing the substance and the mode, mentioned in PM I. 1. 33 – annotation MG) [is acquired] due to transformation characterized by appropriation and permanence and seizing preceding and subsequent shapes”.

¹¹ RVār 1. 20. 3-5.

¹² LTS 365.

¹³ ŚVār VIII. 6.

¹⁴ AB I. 22.

¹⁵ PM I. 1. 34.

The author of PM continues his disquisition, stating that the real entity (*vastu*), being neither the substance (*na dravya-rūpam*), nor the mode (*na paryāya-rūpam*), nor both of them (*nôbhaya-rūpam*), is engaged in causal activity at the same time (*yugapad*) or successively (*krameṇa*) due to relevant auxiliary conditions (*upakāra*) in concomitant vicinity (*sahāri-sannidhāne*)¹⁶. To make a progress the substance has to participate in cause and effect order and each change can be considered from distinct points of view.

Akalaṅka gives an opinion, that existence of living being (*jīvasyāstitvaṃ*) is pervaded by all entities (*sarveṇāstitvena vyāpta iti*), i.e. obtained (*prāptam*) through existence of matter etc. (*puḍgalādy-astitvenāpi*), because it is elicited by word *syād* (*śabdena tathā prāpitatvāt*) used to describe reality from different perspectives, which are ostensibly mutually exclusive¹⁷.

The relation between soul and matter is specific and unassailable. Padmarajiah states:

“The Jaina, who, as a realist, firmly believes in an ultimately or irreducibly dualistic reality of soul and the material world, does not, therefore, subscribe to this idealistic spiritualisation of the world” [Padmarajiah 1963, 254].

To sum up, complementarity, mutual dependency and relation are extensively analyzed in the Jain philosophy. All other issues as well should be considered from this point of view. What is important, and this is the main point the paper highlights, is the fact that matter, as the soul's attendant, helps a person speak. *Tattvārthasūtra-rājavārṭtika* (“Royal Explanatory of *Tattvārtha-sūtra*”) [RVār] expresses straightforwardly that ability to produce sounds, as well as possession of mind, is possible for the soul that owns the body¹⁸. The important role is played by mind. Material atoms in the air and in mind have innate capacity for forming themselves into groups or matter aggregates¹⁹. Mind is substantial (*paugdalika*) and concurrently is a domain of *jīva*, that is why it consists of palpable aggregates, but

¹⁶ PM I. 1. 34.

¹⁷ RVār IV. 42. 5.

¹⁸ RVār V. 9. 9, p. 160–161.

¹⁹ RVār V. 3. 3, p. 79–80.

distinguished by a specific subtlety. It can be improved and perfected, together with other two spheres of human activity, i.e. body and speech, until a person reaches the state of omniscience.

An Omniscient and the Material Word

An idea of an omniscient person is the core of the Jain epistemology. It is an expression of a belief that human being possesses ability to acquire – according to different and appointed practices – omniscience (*kevala-jñāna*, *kevala-darśana*, *sarva-jñā*). This subject has been undertaken in such treatises as: TS, Umasvāti's *Tattvârtha-sûtra-bhāṣya* ("The Commentary to *Tattvârtha-sûtra*") [TSBh] by and *Samaya-sāra* ("The Quintessence of Collocations") [SSār] by Kundakunda (4th/5th c. CE), *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* ("Reflection on Authority") [AM] by Samantabhadra (6/7th c. CE), *Sarvârtha-siddhi* ("The Attainment of all Goals") [SAS] by Pūjyapāda (5th c. CE), *Dvātriṃśikā* ("The Collection of Thirty Two") [DT] by Siddhasena Divākara (6th c. CE), DŚ, *Paramâtma-prakaśa* ("The Elucidation of the Supreme Soul") [PAP] by Yogīndudeva (8th c. CE), RVār, LTS, *Aṣṭasāhasrī* ("The Eight Thousand") [ASā] by Vidyānanda (10th c. CE), the commentary to *Laghu-tattva-sphoṭa* ("A Light Bursting of the Reality") [LTS] by Amṛtachandra-sūri (10th c. CE), Akalaṅka's *Aṣṭasatī* ("The Eight Hundred") [AS] and *Satya-śāsana-parīkṣā* ("The Analysis of True Knowledge") [SŚP] by Vidyānanda, *Dravya-saṃgraha* ("The Compendium of Substance") [DS] by Nemichandra (10th c. CE) and many others²⁰.

R. J. Singh rightly suggests:

"a general idea about an omniscient being as knowing everything is not enough. We must know the particular and specific individual possessing omniscience" [Singh 1974, 11].

The author of SAS claims that self can be material and non-material, owing to the fact that it has modes of karmic bondage²¹. Because human activity (*yoga*) applies to operation of mind, body and speech [Singh 1974, 122], the state of omniscience affects all of these spheres, ruining all types of karman, including karman veiling language abilities (*śruta-jñāna*) [Singh 1974, 220]. Therefore, omniscience is a

²⁰ Dating on the basis of Malvania, Jayendra 2007.

²¹ SAS II. 7-8.

state of total karmic annihilation (*kṣayôpaśamīkānāṃ jñānānāṃ kevalinī*)²². Singh stresses that the omniscient can see everything that has form and everything that is formless [Singh 1974, 160].

One of the first sources mentioning this issue is ViP with a passage presenting a figure of the omniscient, underlining the unique ability of all-knowing person to perceive a sound (pkr. *sadda*, skr. *śabda*), together with other components of reality:

342a “Only the kevalin, not the imperfect monk (chaumattha) wholly discerns (jāṇai pāsai) the following ten items: the fundamental entities [1] Motion, [2] Rest and [3] Space; [4] the soul not joined to a body, jīva a-sarīra-paḍibaddha, [5] the [separate?] atom, [6] sound, sadda, [7] smell, [8] wind, vāya, [9] who will be a Jina and who will not, and [10] who will attain liberation and who will not”²³.

Amṛtachandra, in order to stress the exceptional characteristic of perceiving and processing sounds ability, formulate an ascertainment in AM:

sva tvamevāsi nirdoṣo yukta-śāstra-virodha-vāk. avirodho yudiṣṭaṃ te prasiddhena na bādhyate²⁴.

“And such an omniscient personage you alone are whose utterance is neither in conflict with logic nor in conflict with scripture. As for the proof of such an absence of conflict, it is the circumstance that what you seek to establish is never contradicted by what is known to be the case”.

Devasena (10th c. CE) clearly expresses this problem in *Ālāpāpaddhati* (“The Course of Question”) [AP], paying attention to the nature of matter, i.e. to its substance and modes. He gives the following definition of the omniscient’s knowledge:

jaṇai tikālavisae davvaguṇe pajjāe ya vahubheda. paccakhaṃ ca parokkhaṃ aṇeṇa nāṇattisaṃ ceṃti.

jānāni tri-kāla-viṣayāt dravya-guṇāt paryāyāṃś ca bahu-bhedān. pratyakṣaṃ ca parokṣaṃ anena jñānam iti idam bruvant²⁵.

²² RVār I. 30. 8.

²³ ViP, p. 146.

²⁴ AM I. 6. Quotations from AM with translations on the basis of *Samantabhadra’s Āpta-mīmāṃsā. Critique of An Authority [Along with English Translation, Introduction, Notes and Akalaṅka’s Sanskrit Commentary Aṣṭaśatī]*, tr., ed. Nagin J. Shah, Sanskrit-Sanskriti Granthamālā 7, Ahmedabad 1999.

“(That) by which (the soul) knows (all) the substances, (and their) attributes, pertaining to the three times (past, present and future), directly and indirectly, is the knowledge (j), so they say”.

It is worth remembering that common knowledge – due to the Jain philosophy – is able to comprehend one meaning at one time and cannot lead to the discrimination of substance from quality:

[...] na guṇâdi-parityâgenânyo dravyasya viśeṣaḥ svataḥ prasiddho'sti²⁶.

“It is not possible to achieve by nature peculiarity of different substance through [its] separation from qualities etc.”

Nemichandra, the author of *Gommaṭa-sāra* (“The Quintessence of Gommaṭa”) [GS], adds²⁷:

prajñāpanīyā bhāvā ananta-bhāgastu anabhilāpyānām.
prajñāpīyānām punaḥ ananta-bhāgaḥ śruta-nibaddha²⁸.

“Expressible matters (i.e. the total of knowledge as expressed by the Adorable (Arahanta) himself in his enlightened voice, divyadhani or letterless speech, anakṣaravam) is an infinite part of inexpressible (matter; i.e. the total of all what is known to the omniscient). And only an infinite part of expressible (matter) can be digested a scriptural (knowledge)”.

The omniscient is supposed to annihilate factors responsible for obstructing (*avarāṇa*) knowledge of all types, including the knowledge of sounds. To illustrate this intuition Akalaṅka states:

pratipuruṣaṃ hi mati-śrutâvaraṇa-kṣayôpaśamo bahudhā bhinnāḥ tad-bhedād bāhya-nimitta-bhedāc ca śrutasya prakarṣâprakarṣa-yogo bhavati mati-pūrvakatvâviśeṣe'pi²⁹.

²⁵ GS 266.

²⁶ RVār I. 1. 16.

²⁷ All quotations and translations on the basis of *The Sacred Books of the Jainas. Gommaṭasara Jīva-kāṇḍa*, Rai Bahadur J. L. Jaini, Pandit Ajit Prasada, The Central Jaina Publishing House Ajitashram, Lucknow 1927.

²⁸ GS 334.

²⁹ RVār I. 20. 9.

“Since for each man complete annihilation of sensory and scriptural knowledge’s obstruction, repeatedly interrupted because of modification of it and because of modification of external causes, is a joint between potentiality and non-potentiality of scriptural [knowledge] in non-distinction preceded by sensory knowledge”.

Omniscience is of great importance because it is the highest attestation of human liberating skills from constant rebirth. Akalañka reaffirms it by saying:

saṃsāriṇaḥ puruṣasya sarveṣv artheṣu mokṣaḥ pradhānam, pradhāne ca kṛto
yatnaḥ phalavān bhavati tasmāt tan mārgōpadeśaḥ kāryaḥ tad arthatvāt³⁰.

“Liberation of person immersed in saṃsāra amongst all goals is the most important [one], and in [that] primary [goal] realized effort is that, which brings fruit, hence an instruction concerning a way to realization, because it is meaningful”.

To reach omniscience one has to cross over twelve stages of knowledge, but – what is more important – to reach a supreme knowledge one has to gain a right vision (*samyag-darśana*), which has been clarified in RVār in the following way: “the attainment of the highest knowledge is waited upon the attainment of the right vision” (*pūrva-samyag-darśana-lābhe uttara-jñāna-lābho bhajanīyaḥ*)³¹.

According to *Sarvajña-siddhi* (“The Accomplishment of Omniscience”) [SJS] the omniscient is a person, who distinguishes everything (*sarvo viśeṣaḥ sarvajñaḥ*), because he is withdrawn by the property of speaking (*vakṛtvena hy apodyate*) and surmounted difference (*apodita-viśeṣa*)³². He³³ is called “one who has attained his object” (*siddhaḥ*), an Arhat (*jina*) and “he who has accomplished his aim” (*siddhārthā*)³⁴.

In a case of a person who does not enter the higher stages of development, words and sounds can be examined from different angles – from linguistic (*śabda-naya*), etymological (*samabhirūḍha-naya*) and

³⁰ RVār I. 1. 3.

³¹ RVār I. 1. 71.

³² SJS 19.

³³ I am using a form “he” to describe the omniscient, because of masculine forms used in described texts, but it is worth remembering that according to Śvetāmbara sect women are also capable of acquire the state of omniscience.

³⁴ SJS 67.

constructionist (*evambhūta-naya*) ones³⁵. The omniscient surpasses these perspectives realising all of them simultaneously³⁶.

It is worth considering if language speaking is contradictory to omniscience. Akalaṅka argues in *Sidhi-viniścaya* (“The Ascertainment of Perfection”) [SV] that it is not³⁷. The omniscient’s relation to language changes according to the stage he attends: the omniscient with mind, body and speech (*sayoga-kevalī*) is immersed in language, but the omniscient without these three components of human activity (*ayogya-kevalī*) is absolutely deprived of dependency on matter, and in consequence free from the intellectual intermingling in physical world [Jain 2012, 78–79]. The omniscient, free from medium of senses, cognizing substances with their modes – words as the modes of matter among others – is able to modify only his own substance, since he himself is the material cause (*upādāna*), so the ability to speak is within him. From one point of view he is without speech, because he has achieved the peak of perfection and he has broken off the connection with the material world, but from the other one he is able to speak, because as a human being he expresses himself only by his own virtue. Words, instrumental in nature (*nimitta*), are just catalysts and assistants (*upakāra*). What is more, Samantabhadra, without distinguishing between *sayoga-kevalī* and *ayogya-kevalī*, says that an omniscient is able to produce words – infallible (*nirdoṣaḥ*) and treating of what is suitable (*yukti-śāstrāvirodhi*)³⁸.

It is worth remembering that, according to the Jain philosophy, everything, including language, should be considered from different points of view. When the Jain thinkers treat a word as the mode of matter, they do not consider it to be sufficient to receive a full expression and articulation. To speak, a man has to use his own virtue with a help of words as facilitators. That is why the omniscient is also

³⁵ AP 76-79. AP clarifies that the linguistic perspective gives an explanation of term such as i.e. “*dārā*” (“wife”) assigning synonyms “*bhārgā*” or “*kalatram*” to it. Another example is “*jalam*” (“water”), which can be expressed as “*āpaḥ*”. As to the etymological perspective Devasena lists “*gau paśuḥ*”, which means “a cow [is] domestic animal.” The constructionist perspective is presented as follows: “*indatīti indraḥ*”, which means “Indra [is someone who] is powerful”.

³⁶ Cf. PKM 2.12.

³⁷ SV 8.

³⁸ AM 5.

capable of producing utterances – not matter but his own substance, the soul, is engaged and responsible for this act³⁹.

³⁹ Artykuł został sfinansowany ze środków Narodowego Centrum Nauki, nr rejestracyjny projektu: UMO-2014/13/N/HS1/01061, tytuł „Dżinijska filozofia języka w okresie klasycznym (V–X w.) i jej epistemologiczne oraz ontologiczne konsekwencje”.

The article is funded by National Science Centre under the project no. UMO-2014/13/N/HS1/01061 entitled “Jaina Philosophy of Language in Classical Period (5th–10th c. CE) and Its Epistemological and Ontological Implications”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jain, Br. Hem Chand, *Jain Concept of Omniscience*, [in:] S. P. Pandey (ed.), *Select Papers on Jainism. Study Notes V. 5. 0.* 2012, Delhi: International School for Jain Studies, pp. 69–81.
- Malvania, Dalsukh, Soni, Jayendra (eds.), 2007, *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, vol. 10, *Jain Philosophy*, part 1, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ.
- Monier-Williams, M., 2005, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ.
- Muni, Nyayavijaya, 1998, *Jaina Philosophy and Religion*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Bhogilal Lehar Chand Institute of Indology & Mahattara Sadhvi Shree Mrigavatiji Foundation.
- Potter, Karl H., 1991, *Presuppositions of India's Philosophies*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ.
- Singh, Ramjee, 1974, *The Jaina Concept of Omniscience*, Ahmedabad: L. D. Series 43.

SOURCES

- AB = Harṣavardhana Gaṇi: *Adhyātma-bindu. Harṣavardhana's Adhyātmabindu: with Autocommentary.* 1972, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology.
- AM = Samantabhadra: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā.* Gajadharalal Jain (ed.), *Āpta-mīmāṃsā Pramāṇa-parīkṣā ca.* 1914, Kāśī: Bhāratīya Jaina Siddhānta Prakāśinī Saṃsthā.
- AS = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Aṣṭasatī.* Cf. AM.
- ASā = Vidyānanda: *Aṣṭāhasrī.* Nāthāraṅgaji Gāṃdhī (ed.), *Aṣṭāhasrī.* 1915, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press.
- DS = Nemichandra Siddhanta Chakravarti: *Dravya-saṃgraha.* S. C. Ghoshal (ed.), *Dravya-saṃgraha.* 1989, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- DŚ = Jinabhadra Gaṇi: *Dhyāna-śataka.* S. K. Ramachandra Rao (ed.), *Dhyāna-śataka.* 2002, Bengaluru: Kalpatharu Research Academy.

- DT = Siddhasena Divākara: *Dvātriṃśikā*. Vijayalāvanayasūri (ed.), *Dvātriṃśaddvātriṃśikā*. 1977, Botad.
- GS = Nemichandra Siddhanta Chakravarti: *Gommaṭa-sāra*. *The Sacred Books of the Jains*. *Gommatasara Jīva-kāṇḍa*, vol. 5, tr., com. Rai Bahadur J. L. Jaini. 1927, Lucknow: Pandit Ajit Prasada, The Central Jaina Publishing House Ajitashram.
- LTS = Amṛtachandra: *Laghu-tattva-sphoṭa*. Padmanabh Srivarma Jaini (ed.), *Laghu-tattva-sphoṭa*. 1978, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology.
- PAP = Yogīndudeva: *Paramâtma-prakāśa*. Jagdish Prasad Jain Sadhak (ed.), *Paramâtma-prakāśa*, tr. Rickhab Dass Jain. 2000, Delhi: Radiant Publishers.
- PKM = Prabhācandra: *Prameya-kamala-mārtaṇḍa*. Mahendrakumar Sastri (ed.), *Prameya-kamala-mārtaṇḍa*. 1990, Delhi: Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series, Sri Satguru Publications.
- PM = Hemachandra: *Pramāṇa-mīmāṃsā*. S. Mookerjee, N. Tatia (eds.), *Pramāṇa-mīmāṃsā*. 1970, Varanasi: Tara Publications.
- RVār = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Tattvārtha-sūtra-rāja-vārttika*. Mahendrakumar Jain (ed.), *Tattvārtha-vārttikam [rāja-vārttikam]*. Hindī anuvāda sahita. 1953, Kāśī: Bhāratīya Jñānapītha.
- RVār(b) = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Tattvārtha-sūtra-rāja-vārttika*. *The Jaina World of Non-Living [Non-living in Tattvārthasūtra]*. *English Translation with Notes on Chapter Five of Tattvārtha-Rājavārttika od Akalaṅka (Royal-Semi-aphorismic Explanatory of Reals) On Tattvārtha-sūtra (Treatise on Reals) by Ācārya Umāsvāmi*, tr. N. L. Jain. 2000, Varanasi, Pradyuman Zaveri, Plano TX., U.S.A.: Pārśwanātha Vidyāpītha.
- SAS = Pūjyapāda Devanandin: *Sarvārtha-siddhi*. *Tattvārtha-vṛttiḥ Sarvārtha-siddhiḥ*, *Pūjyapāda Devanandin*. Śrīsekharāma Nemichandra Granthāmālā 128. 1939, Ṣodaśapur: Devajā Sakhārām Diśī & Māṇikacandra-digambara-jaina-parīkṣālaya-mantri.
- SJS = Haribhadra-sūri: *Sarvajña-siddhi*. Śīrapura: Śrī Jaina Sāhitya Vardhaka Sabhā.
- SSār = Kundakunda: *Samaya-sāra*. R. B. J. L. Jaini (ed.), *The Sacred Books of the Jains*, vol. 8. 1930, Lucknow: Central Jaina Publishing House.

- ŚŚP = Vidyānanda: *Satya-śāsana-parīkṣā*. Gokulchandra Jain (ed.), *Vidyānandi-kṛta-Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā*. 1964, Varanasi: Jnanapitha Murtidevi Jain Granthamala Sanskrit Grantha no. 30.
- SV = Akalaṅka Bhaṭṭa: *Siddhi-viniścaya*. Mahendrakumār Jain (ed.), *Siddhi-viniścaya of Akalaṅka edited with the commentary Siddhi-viniścaya-tīkā of Anantavīrya*, 2 vols. 1959, Vārāṇasī: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana.
- ŚVār = Vidyānanda, *Tattvārtha-sūtra-śloka-vārttika*. Jayendra Soni (ed.), *Aspects of Jaina Philosophy. Lectures Delivered Under the Auspices of Annual Lecture Series 1994-95 at the Department of Jainology, University of Madras*. 1996, Madras: Research Foundation for Jainology.
- TS = Umāsvāmi/Umāsvāti: *Tattvārtha-sūtra*. Sh. C. Jain (ed.), *Jainism, Key to Reality*, tr., Sh. C. Jain. 2011, Jambudweep, Hastinapur: Digamar Jain Trilok Shodh Sansthan.
- TSBh = *Tattvārtha-sūtra-bhāṣya*. Ohira Suzuko (ed.), *A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya*. 1982, Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.
- ViP = *Viyāhapannatti*. J. Deleu (ed.), *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaī). The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon. Introduction, Critical Analysis, Commentary & Indexes*. 1970, Brugge (België): "De Tempel", Tempelhof 37.

ABSTRACT

LANGUAGE DYNAMICS IN THE CASE OF AN OMNISCIENT IN THE JAIN LITERATURE OF CLASSICAL PERIOD (5th-10th c. CE)

The article “Language Dynamics in the case of an Omniscient” is the study of the idea of an omniscient person on the basis of the classical Jain literature (5th-10th c. CE) in the context of language materiality, human activity and entanglement of a person into karmic bondage.

KEYWORDS: Jainism, language, sound, matter, mode, living being, mind, epistemology, karmic bondage, omniscience

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: dżinizm, język, dźwięk, materia, przejaw, istota żywa, umysł, epistemologia, więzy karmiczne, wszechwiedza