

**Proceedings of the LectureSeries on “*Vākyapadīya* and
Indian Philosophy of Languages”**
(31.1.08 to 2.2.08)

Venue: ‘Rajashree Hall’, Katyayani Apartment,
Durgakund, Varanasi.

Very recently Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, Eastern Regional Centre, Varanasi, arranged a three-day colloquium on “*Vākyapadīya* and Indian Philosophy of Languages” at the Rajashree Hall of Katyayani Apartment, Durgakund, Varanasi from 31st January to 2nd February, 2008.

The Veteran grammarian MM. Pt. Sitaram Shastri was requested to chair the inaugural session of the programme, while Prof. Kapil Kapoor, Former Rector, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi adorned the chair of chief guest. Within three days six lectures were delivered by Prof. Ram Yatna Shukla, Prof. Kapil Kapoor, Prof. Wagish Shukla and Prof. Shivji Upadhyaya. The following members were present:

1. Pt. Hemendra Nath Chakravarti
2. Prof. Pradyot Kumar Mukhopadhyay
3. Prof. Vagish Shastri
4. Prof. Kailaspati Tripathi
5. Prof. Paras Nath Dwivedi
6. Prof. Bishwanath Bhattacharya
7. Dr. Bettina Baumer
8. Prof. Adya Prasad Mishra
9. Prof. Ram Chandra Pandey
10. Prof. Rajib Ranjan Sinha
11. Prof. Narendra Nath Pandey
12. Prof. Shreekant Pandey
13. Dr. Sudhakar Diskhit
14. Prof. Bal Shastri
15. Prof. Krishna Kant Sharma
16. Prof. Shree Narayan Mishra
17. Pt. Ramakant Pandey

18. Prof. Vayu Nandan Pandey
19. Prof. Ramesh Chandra Panda
20. Pt. Kamalakant Tripathi
21. Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi
22. Prof. Reva Prasad Dwivedi
23. Dr. Kamalesh Jha
24. Dr. Mark Dyszkowski
25. Dr. Rama Ghosh
26. Dr. Chandrakanta Rai
27. Dr. Shitala Prasad Upadhyay
28. Dr. Manudeva Bhattacharya
29. Dr. Jaishankar Lal Tripathi
30. Pt. Purushottam Tripathi
31. Pt. Narendra Nath Tripathi
32. Dr. Manju Sundaram
33. Dr. Swaravandana Sharma
34. Prof. Kamalesh Dutta Tripathi
35. Dr. Sukumar Chattopadhyaya
36. Dr. Pranati Ghosal
37. Dr. Urmila Sharma
38. Dr. Parvati Banerjee
39. Dr. Rama Dubey
40. Pt. Mahendra Nath Pandey
41. Shri Niharkanti, and all the other staff of IGNCA, Varanasi.

Inaugural session of the three day colloquium on “*Vākyapadīya* and Indian Philosophy of Grammar” opened with the chanting of a beautiful prayer to the Goddess *Vāk (Parā)* rendered by Dr. Smt. Manju Sundaram. In the holy atmosphere sanctified by the resonance of benediction, Prof. K.D. Tripathi, Hony. Coordinator, IGNCA, Varanasi welcomed the assembled guests and scholars and introduced the President and Chief Guest before the audience. Later on he delivered the keynote address.

In his lecture Prof. Tripathi gave a brief survey of previous “Lecture Series on *Vākyapadīya*” held and organised by late Pt. V.N. Mishra, then Coordinator, IGNCA, Varanasi in 1995-96. With reference to T.R.V. Murty (Studies in Indian Thought, 1983) he told that in the 19th century, the basis of India’s dialogue with western scholars was Advaita Vedānta. In the end of 19th and the first half of the 20th century it was replaced by Buddhist Philosophy. In the later half of the 20th century, Kashmir Śaivism occupied this position and he hoped, in future decades this role would be played by the Indian Philosophy of Language so-to-say Philosophy of Bhartṛhari or *Vākyapadīya*.

In order to give a background of Western Philosophy of Language, at first he mentioned names of two sets of scholars, among them (1) early Wittgenstein, Chomsky were formalists, who projected language as a rule governed activity and (2) Later Wittgenstein, Austin etc. were communication-intention theorists who highlighted the functionalistic and communicative dimension of language. According to Early Wittgenstein, language is the object of analysis. However, according to traditional Indian thought, language may be identified with the Consciousness. In course of his introductory lecture Prof. Tripathi informed that at the end of *Vākyakāṇḍa*, Bhartṛhari remarked ‘*bhrastah vyakaranāgamaḥ*’; The Agamic tradition of the grammar was lost. Bhartṛhari’s guru is credited to restore it. Buddhist scholars like Diñnāga, Dharmakīrti Kamalaśīla etc. attacked and challenged theories of *Vākyapadīya*. Mīmāṃsakas, Sāṃkhyas and Vedāntins also assailed Bhartṛhari, particularly his theory of ‘sphoṭa’ and Śaivite philosophers like Somānanda also did the same. However, Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta were deeply influenced by Bhartṛhari. On the one hand, it is a treatise of Vyākaraṇa—the chief of all the Vedāṅgas and on the other hand, it is a seminal Agamic text Bhartṛhari says in his auto commentary *pratyak caitanye sanniveśitā vāk*. With these words Prof. Tripathi stated the importance of Bhartṛhari and necessity of cultivating Bhartṛhari’s Philosophy of Language.

Prof. Kapil Kapoor, former Rector, J.N.U., New Delhi, delivered chief guest’s address. In his short discourse, he told that central concept of *Vākyapadīya* is *Śabdabrahma* which is permeated not only in the language, but in the entire existence (*sattā*) of the world. In this text, word itself is conceived as *brahman*. In

course of his lecture, he discussed the concepts of *vikalpa*, *vivarta*, *pariṇāma*, *anukāra* etc.

MM. Sitaram Shastri in his presidential address told that all the systems of Indian Philosophy have their own Highest Principle. In the Philosophy of Grammar, it is the *śabdabrahman*. But it appears to be identical with Advaita Vedānta school. He raised question on the utility of *śabdabrahman* here, which is already established in another system. In order to answer, he stated that, “It is the **Word-Principle** which is conceived as *brahman*. Citing from *Vākyapadīya* he told that all the knowledge of the world is intertwined with word. If this eternal identity of knowledge and word were to disappear, knowledge would cease to be knowledge: “*na so’sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamādṛte / anuviddham iva jñānam sarvam śabdena bhāsate* (Vāk.I.115). In continuation of his speech, Pt. Shastri told, word itself is very short-lived, but not its essence; and this word-essence or *śabda-tattva* is conceived as *brahman*. Entire world is nothing other than its evolutes. From this sound-*brahman*, this world sprang forth as a manifestation of the phonemes. This word-*brahman* not only creates everything but sustains also. Contemplating on *śabda brahma* as a route, the Philosophy of Grammar leads to the Highest Reality—herein lies the excellence of Vyākaraṇadarśana.

The inaugural session ended with vote of thanks rendered by Hony. Coordinator Prof. K.D. Tripathi. The session was coordinated by Dr. Sukumar Chattopadhyay.

1st Session

Prof. Ram Yatna Shukla was the main speaker in the first session of *Vākyapadīya* lecture series, who was supposed to speak on “Metaphysics and Epistemology of *Vākyapadīya* in the Light of *Brahmakāṇḍa*”. But because of the vastness of the topic, Prof. Shukla mainly concentrated on the Metaphysics of *Vākyapadīya* which is lying hidden in the first five verses in the latent form.

At first he mentioned three facets of *Vākyapadīya*, viz. *prakriyā* (the word formation process), *pariṣkāra* (the analysis and perfecting the concept, definition) and *darśana* (philosophy) and then in course of lecture, he discussed how Bhartṛhari rendered *maṅgalācaraṇa* in the introductory verse by mentioning the

subject matter (*vastu-nirdeśa*) i.e. *anādinidhana brahma*, which is nothing other than *akṣara śabda-tattva*. Apart from *maṅgalācaraṇa*, four pre-requisites (i.e. *viśaya*, *prayojana*, *adhikārī* and *sambandha*) also have been discussed through this verse. Here Bhartṛhari has mentioned *sattvarūpa brahman* and continued to discuss later part of *Brahma Kāṇḍa*, *sphoṭa*, *dhvani*. etc. In short, propagation of *śabdabrahman* is the subject matter of the treatise. In this context he mentioned reason of discussing *brahman* in *Vyākaraṇa* i.e. attaining knowledge of Pure *Vāk* or Liberation, which is already established in Advaita Vedānta. It is true that through *janmādyasya yataḥ* (B.S. I.1.2) and *satyam jñānam anantam brahma* (TUp II.1.3), Advaitins have covered both the *tatastha* and *svarūpa lakṣaṇa*, but they did not propound that word-as-such is nothing other than *brahman*. On the contrary, this word is most preferable item for grammarian. To them, this word is identical with Supreme Reality. By meditating over this *śabda-tattva* alias word-principle, aspirant realises Absolute Reality and becomes identical with It. In this way grammarian has given both the definitions; and in the second half of the first verse the theory of creation is presented. As regards this *sṛṣṭiprakriyā* the grammarian has followed the route of *Adhyāropa-apavāda* (Superimposition and De-superimposition).

Obviously, here arises the question regarding *brahman* as the creator of universe. How the Highest Brahman, devoid of all the attributes and differences is evolved in the creative process of world as word, meaning, etc. *Vākyapadīya* says it is with the aid of *śakti*, inseparable from Brahman, creation becomes possible. Thus, this *śabda-tattva* becomes the cause of creation. He raised question on *śabdādvaita* and *brahmādvaita*, whether they are same or separate? In opinion of Prof. Shukla these are merely two names of same thing.

On this deliberation, **Pt. Purushottam Tripathi** delivered presidential address and gave some illuminating comments. *Vākyapadīya* is at the same time grammatical and philosophical treatise. Basically it deals with *vyākaraṇa*, i.e. word, sentence, their meaning, relation etc.—here we find the *prakriyā* phase (process). Secondly it discusses how perfect knowledge and use of word leads to the ultimate goal—here it covers *pariṣkāra* (elucidation/analysis) phase; and overall it has *āgamic* nature—in this way *prakriyā*, *pariṣkāra* and *āgama*—all the three facets are covered in the *Vākyapadīya*. As regards four pre-requisites (1) beginningless,

immutable word is the subject, (2) perfect knowledge of word-principle that is the purpose.... in this way *anubandhacatuṣṭaya* has been discussed.

Prof. Shivji Upadhyaya, Prof. Shreekant Pandey, Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi, Prof. Reva Prasad Dwivedi, Prof. Adya Prasad Mishra raised various questions on the topic which were answered accordingly by the learned speaker. This session was coordinated by Prof. Krishnakant Sharma.

IIInd Session

In the 2nd session **Prof. Kapil Kapoor** spoke on “Word-Essence—as perceived by Bhartṛhari”. Prof. Kapoor started his lecture by mentioning western concept of language. At first he showed terminological difference between Indian and Western thinkers. First of all to Indians, language is *vāk* i.e. speech, whereas the westerners think it as “writing process/script.” To the Greeks script was sacred, they worshipped it. To them, thing which is visible, is authentic; and as because script is visual that is authentic. In that sense, *śabda* is authentic and conceived as god. Whatever the Bible or Angel says, is authentic. Hence, the status of language as *vāk* in India and that of language as script in Europe is somewhat different.

Secondly European philosopher says language is explanatory and they define everything by giving name and description. On the other hand oriental thinker says—language is *sattātmaka*. Language/*Vāk* is already there—it is *vāk*, from which this Universe has been emanated. Thirdly, to the western thinker language is communicative design or system. They define language in terms of behaviourism through communication. They believe in pattern practice. But in India language is a cognitive system. They also believe in communication, but that is secondary. To Indian thinkers, foundation of communication is cognition. Prof. Kapoor told that Saussure the resident of Switzerland, introduced modern linguistics in Europe. Till this time, western thinkers concentrated mainly on the pattern practice of language. It is Prof. Saussure who stressed on the language as a cognitive system and since then, it became the subject of Modern Linguistics in Universities.

As regards Indian concept of Linguistics, Prof. Kapoor told that there was a long tradition of language even before Bhartṛhari. According to the Mīmāṃsaka-s

language of Śruti is not referential, they are metaphoric; therefore instead of explicit meaning, implied meaning would be pertinent. Hence, they explain Vedic *mantra* by using the key of *Nirukta* and Mīmāṃsā texts. In later days Yāska in his *Nirukta* has given etymological meanings of words, but by that time meaning has been changed to some extent; therefore Kautsa questioned their validity.

Yaska stated, in order to determine meaning of Vedic *mantra-s*, etymological meaning is necessary. Buddhist ontologists say, this total enquiry is in vain. Word/language is used to express mental impression of things. But this word is momentary, hence, it is meaningless. In spite of that continuity in the worldly transaction (i.e. usage of word and comprehending its meaning) indicates peoples' same line of thinking. According to Mīmāṃsakas esp. Śābarasvāmin, meaning of words should be comprehended from the usage. It is lying hidden in *vyavahāra* (usage). Bhartṛhari says, meaning of word is inherent in the word itself. That is why the person who knows the correct word, can comprehend its meaning even from a wrong use. Hence, meaning is cognitive and not referential. In the *Mahābhāṣya*, grasping of meaning is described as a mental exercise, that is why appearance of same woman arouses different feelings in different people.

In course of his lecture Prof. Kapoor told Bhartṛhari's philosophy is based on the Veda and Pātañjala Philosophy i.e. Yoga system. According to Naiyāyika *śabda* is atom (*aṇu*). Mīmāṃsa describes it as air (*vāyuvātmaka*), while to the Jainas it is *puṅgava* only. But for Bhartṛhari, *śabda* is nothing other than knowledge. He says, there is no cognition in the world, in which word does not figure. All knowledge is intertwined with word. In his view, matter and energy are not separate. Entire world is pulsating/energised matter. As regards its creation, it may be said that, grammarian propound creation from word as intellectual exercise; and in that sense word is *brahman*. That, which is inarticulated and employed in the creative process is *Brahman*.

Bhartṛhari explained *anādi* as a thing whose beginning (*ādi*) is not known. In that sense word is *anādi* (beginningless), *akṣara* (imperishable), *avikāra* (devoid of any change) and *akrama* (not having sequence); but the question is *vaikharī vāk* is *savikāri* and *sakrama* (sequential), how this *vaikharī vāk* leads to the realisation of Supreme Principle? Bhartṛhari solved this problem that *parā*, *paśyantī*, *madhyamā*

and *vaikharī*—these are only levels of language. But western thinkers concentrate only on *vaikharī vāk* i.e. heard language. Bhartṛhari accepted traditional four levels: *parā vāk* as cognitive (*saṅkalpātmaka*), *paśyantī* as wind-form (*vāyvātmaka*) according to the cognition, *madhyamā* as alphabetic (though very subtle—*varṇātmaka*) and *vaikharī* in the form of sound (*dhvanyātmaka*) i.e. hard language.

This sound (*śabda*) is the origin of worldly process, same is the origin of Veda-s. Because, entire Literature is formed out of *śabda* without which one cannot cognise anything and without cognition so-to-say knowledge, aspirant cannot attain Liberation. In that sense four levels of *śabda* are steps to the Liberation.

In this context Prof. Kapoor discussed on the concept of *apaśabda* and necessity of using perfect word and its reward. Because according to the grammarians to achieve the Highest Goal, knowledge of perfect word and its proper employment is necessary. That is why *Mahābhāṣya* has prohibited the wrong use of word (*duṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ*) and corrupt words (*apaśabda*). Patañjali says, the person who knows the secret of words, knowledge is his refuge (*atha yo vāgyogavid vijñānam tasya saranam*).

Dr. Ramakant Pandey raised some question regarding exact meaning of *duṣṭa śabda*, *mleccha śabda*, *apaśabda* etc . which were accordingly solved by Prof. Krishnakant Sharma, who coordinated the entire session.

Pradyot Kumar Mukhopadhyaya in his presidential observation raised some questions for examination especially in course of research work on *Vākyapadīya*;

- (1) How a person, even a non-grammarians can raise questions on grammatic theories? In the grammatical system mainly two sets of treatises texts are there, on process (*prakriyātmaka*) and analytic or philosophical (*tattvanirṇayātmaka*). Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* belongs to the first category. In order to analyse these *prakriyā* texts analysis and philosophical texts have been composed. *Mahābhāṣya* and *Vākyapadīya* belong to the latter group. Now the question is regarding meaning of the word *darśana* in *Vyākaraṇa darśana* or *Bhāṣādarśana*.

(2) Another question, what is this Philosophy of Language? According to Prof. Mukhopadhyaya, any *darśana* comprises at least three necessary factors: (1) Supreme Principle—and thence the creation of world, (2) Means of knowing this principle and (3) Emancipation through that knowledge. These three mark the characteristics of *darśana*. In this sense Nyāya, Vedānta these are schools of philosophy. *Vākyapadīya* also fulfills these criteria. Further, any conceptual or analytical study may be defined as *darśana*; and in this sense *Vākyapadīya* is called Philosophy of Language. It is an analytical study of language about (1) the nature of language, (2) how it is learnt, (3) how languages relate to the world, (4) how linguistic communication is possible, and (5) whether it can be a valid source of knowledge? *Vākyapadīya* covers all these aspects. It provides us both a philosophy of language and a *darśana* of the school of Linguistics.

Central concept of Bhartṛhari's *Vyākaraṇa darśana* is *sphoṭa*. Prof. Mukhopadhyay remarked, it is surprising that all the schools of philosophy accept Pāṇini's Grammar and utilise it, but with exception to Mīmāṃsakas, especially Maṇḍana Mīśra, nobody accepted *sphoṭa*. Not only they are reluctant to accept this theory, they rejected it almost harshly. What is their standpoint? Another question is regarding the relationship between *sphoṭa* and this philosophy of language. According to the *sphoṭavāda*, word is the first principle (*tattva*) and in that sense it is *brahman*. Bhartṛhari has propounded that this *śabda* and *brahman* as one and same with knowledge.

The Śāṅkara school uses the word *jñāna* in case of an ordinary cognition (like *ghaṭajñāna*) as well as in the Absolute Knowledge. In case of *ghaṭajñāna* consciousness is reflected in the psychosis of integral organ (*antaḥkaraṇa vṛtti*) in the form of *ghaṭa*. But in case of *satyam, jñānam anantam brahma* or *aham brahmāsmi*—here realisation/cognition is not in the form of psychosis of internal organ (*vṛttyātmaka*). Absolute Consciousness and inert psychosis of internal organ (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*)—in both the cases the word *jñāna* is used. In that case one use is primary or *mukhya* while the other one must be secondary or *gauṇa*.

The Brahmādvaita school has solved this problem in this way: knowledge is illuminating, here *ghaṭajñāna*, i.e. that which is defined by the psychosis of

internal organ in the form of a *ghaṭa*, cannot be designated as knowledge. Knowledge is that which dispels ignorance about *ghaṭa*. The function of *vṛtti* ends in dispelling ignorance; it is knowledge, so-to-say Consciousness, which reveals the *ghaṭajñāna*. Brahmādvaitins say *ajñānanāśakatvat, viśayaprakāśakatvacca jñānatvam*. Now this illuminative nature (*prakāśakatva*) pertains to both the *śabda/vāk* and knowledge. Now the question is the word *vāk* appearing in *Vāgrūpatā cedutkrāmed avabodhasya śāsvatī*—whether it is word-principle or the heard-language i.e. *vaikharī vāk*? Prof. Mukhopadhyaya placed the question but left it unsolved.

Grammarians use the word *vāk* in two places in association with (1) *pramāṇa* and (2) *śakti*. The word, in association with *pramāṇa* stands for *vākya* or *pada* while in association with *śakti* it means *artha* (the meaning).

At least he told that *śāstras* are not required to maintain our day-to-day routine life. The purpose of *śāstra* is to lead us to the ultimate goal of our life i.e. knowledge. (1) Acquisition, (2) preservation and (3) expansion of knowledge—these three are the purpose of philosophical treatises.

At the end of his lecture Hony. Coordinator summed up the session and rendered vote of thanks to all. This session was coordinated by Prof. Ramesh Chandra Panda.

IIIrd Session (1.2.2008)

The third session of the lecture series started on 1.2.2008 morning with the Vedic chanting by Pt. N.N. Tripathi. Here main speaker was Prof. Ramyatna Shukla and members of Presidium were Prof. Parasathan Dwivedi and Prof. Shreenarayan Mishra.

Prof. Ram Yatna Shukla enunciated the concept of *sphoṭa* in *Vākyapadīya*. In the first half of the benedictory verse Bhartṛhari has given the *svarūpa lakṣaṇa* and in the second half he has given *tatasthalakṣaṇa* of *śabdabrahma*. In course of his detailed speech, he discussed on the etymology of *sphoṭa*: *sphuṭatiartha yasmāt sa sphoṭaḥ* or *sphuṭyate anena iti sphoṭaḥ*—according to this etymology the word (*śabda*) and its meaning (*artha*) both are connotated by the term *sphoṭa*. Next, the learned speaker discussed on the necessity of accepting *sphoṭa*. Because of the momentary nature of word, meaning cannot be comprehended directly and in order to

comprehend the entire meaning *sphoṭa* is necessary. He continued that last phoneme with the help of impression left by the previous ones, conveys the meaning of the word consisting of many alphabets (*pūrvapūrvā varṇoccarita saṃskāra-sahakṛta-caramavarṇa-śravaṇāt sadasad anekavarṇāvagāhinī padapratītir jāyate, sa eva sphoṭaḥ*)—this is established as *sphoṭa* in the Mīmāṃsā texts. Next he discussed eight varieties of *sphoṭa*: (1) *varṇasphoṭa*, (2) *padasphoṭa*, (3) *vākyasphoṭa*, (4) *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*, (5) *akhaṇḍa vākyasphoṭa*, and *jātisphoṭa* pertaining to (6) *varṇa*, (7) *pada* and (8) *vākya* and their functions. In course of his lecture citing quotations from *Mahābhāṣya* and *Vārttika*, he established the perpetuity of (1) *sphoṭa*, (2) word, (3) meaning and (4) their relation.

On this lecture main dicussants were Prof. N. Sreenivasan, and Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi, who discussed the status of *sphoṭa* from the standpoint of Mīmāṃsā School and Alaṅkāra School. Prof. Sudhakar Dikshit covered the same concept in the view of Nyāya Philosophy.

Prof. Shree Narayan Mishra, one of the members of presidium, gave his observations over the speech. At first he mentioned some difficulties of understanding theories established in *Vākyapadīya* independently.

1. In Bhartṛhari's work *Vyākaraṇa* for the first time became, a full scale *darśana*, a purposive view of Reality.
2. The first commentator Helārāja commented on the text who was at least 700 years distant from Bhartṛhari. As a result of this gap, meanings of word have been changed to some extent.
3. Another commentator Nāgeśabhaṭṭa has interpreted verses of *Vākyapadīya* from the standpoint of Kashmir Śaivism. As a result of this coating of Śaivite philosophy, it is difficult to comprehend theories of *Vyākaraṇa darśana* independently.

Bhartṛhari established three levels of *vāk*, he has not mentioned name of *parāvāk* distinctly.

According to Prof. Mishra to understand *Vyākaraṇadarśana* properly, *Vākyapadīya* needs further study, research and correct analysis.

In course of his speech he stated *śabdattva* may also be interpreted as *śabdagamyatattva*. In his view, if *anādinidhana brahma* identical with word-principle

manifests in the creative process in the form of meaning, in that case its eternity may be challenged. With example of *dravya śaktivāda* and *jātiśaktivāda* from *Mahābhāṣya*, Prof. Mishra told that merging of earlier phonemes in the later ones, stands for extinction of individual phoneme not of the genus-phoneme, therefore, direct comprehension of the total meaning is possible. According to Prof. Mishra, Patañjali's purpose was to systematise the language and not to establish philosophical theories. For that reason, at the time of elucidating *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* sometimes he established *dravyaśaktivāda* and sometimes supported *jātiśaktivāda*.

Hony. Coordinator examined all the objections raised by Prof. Mishra and summed up the lecture so far.

Prof. Parasanath Dwivedi, another member of presidium examined the theory of *sphoṭa* from the standpoint of Monistic School of Vedānta. But he started with Nyāya view of *sphoṭa* and told that Naiyāyikas do not accept grammarian's view on *sphoṭa*. In course of his lecture he stated *śabda* may be eternal or may not, but even then meanings are comprehended. Now the question is regarding necessity of establishing eternity of *śabda*. Śāṅkara has examined this point in details in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* under the topic "Gods" (BS I.3.28-I.3.30). According to this system validity of *śruti* can be established only when eternity of *śabda*, *artha* and their relation is established. Naiyāyikas managed this purpose through the instrumentality of *Īvara* and rejected *sphoṭa*. The word which enters the ear, is word-essence and not the alphabet (*varṇa*) nor is it word (*pada*) nor the sentence (*vākya*). Śāṅkara in the *Devatādhikaraṇa* at first rejected Mīmāṃsā view that last phoneme with the help of impressions left by the previous one conveys the meaning. But refusal of the perpetuity of *śabda* nullifies the validity of Veda-s. Therefore he agreed with Upavarṣa's view *gakaraukara visarjñyāḥ* and accepted *varṇasphoṭa*. *Varṇa* conveys the sense of *pada* and then only meaning is comprehended. Prof. Dwivedi citing from Śāṅkara established *gakaraukara visarjñyāḥ gavārthasya vācakāḥ sa uccāraṇādeva jayate, anuccaranāt arthabodhaḥ na jayate*. When *pūrvapakṣin* objects that without accepting *sphoṭa*, *pada pratiti* would become impossible, in that case Śāṅkara accepted something like *padātma*; but other varieties of *sphoṭa* are not accepted in Śāṅkara's system. In Śāṅkara's term,

that would be a *garīyasī kalpanā* (BS I.3.28). This session was coordinated by Prof. Bal Shastri.

IVth Session

In the fourth session speaker was Prof. Wagish Shukla and his topic was “Vākyapadīya, Bhartṛhari and his Commentators.” Session was presided over by Prof. Bhagirath Prasad Tripathi (Vagish Shastri) and coordinated by Dr. Kamalesh Jha.

In the beginning of session Hony Coordinator Prof. K.D. Tripathi introduced the speaker and president before the audience and presented a bibliography of *Vākyapadīya* and its related works during last hundred years. Then he raised some questions on (1) the difference between Advaita Vedāntins and Grammar school regarding the concept of *vivarta*, (2) difference between *ābhāsa* and *pratibhāsa*, (3) *kālasakti* is a concomitant power of *avidyāsakti*, why is it again defined as *svātantrya śakti* by Helārāja? Prof. Tripathi expected these problems to be solved in the consequent lectures.

Prof. Wagish Shukla was supposed to talk on “Bhartṛhari, Vākyapadīya and its Commentators.” At first Prof. Shukla mentioned the names of commentators of Bhartṛhari viz. Vṛṣabha or Ṛṣabhadeva, Helārāja, Puṇyarāja, Raghunatha Sarman, etc. In course of his speech he told that at the end of Vākyakāṇḍa Bhartṛhari mentioned name of one of his predecessor, Candracarya. Whether he is same as Candragomin, the author of *Candra Vyākaraṇa*? Is *Cāndravākaraṇa* a treatise of *Mahābhāṣya* tradition? Later, he mentioned names of some other exponents, viz. Lakṣmaṇa, Rāvaṇa, etc. who have been referred to in the commentaries of *Vākyapadīya*.

As regards three or four levels of *vāk*, Prof. Shukla remarked that *paśyantī*, *madhyamā* and *vaikharī* are individual forms of *vāk*, while *parā* is considered as collective form of other three. He cited different lines on Bhartṛhari from different texts of Sanskrit literature. While discussing on relation between Sanskrit and Apabhraṃśa, he told that there are so many non-Pāṇinian uses in the Pāṇini Grammar itself.

Prof. Bhagirah Prasad Tripathi (Vagish Shastri) in his presidential address examined all the points of the speaker and told that Pāṇini's uses were not non-Pāṇinian. In those cases our revered Grammarian accepted the uses of his predecessor *ācārya-s* as such.

In course of his lecture Prof. Shastri raised question on the date of Bhartṛhari, his identification, etc.

In the vast range of Sanskrit Literature at least names of three Bhartṛharis have been recorded. 1) Bhartṛhari—the author of *Vākyapadīya*, (2) Bhartṛhari—the composer of *Śatakatraya* and (3) *Bhaṭṭi*—the author of *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, whether these are names of same person or different ones? In case, all these are composition of same persons, it would be problematic to determine his date. Although both the *Vākyapadīya* and *Bhaṭṭikāvya* are composition of about 4th cent. *Śatakatraya* is ascribed to roughly 10th/11th cent. But similarity of language in *Vākyapadīya* and *Śatakatraya* cannot be denied.

Bhartṛhari has given a full shape of this vast anthology—herein lies his speciality. In his composition Bhartṛhari referred to many of his predecessors like Candra, Vasurāta etc. belonging to 4th century, who were influenced by Pāṇini system of grammar.

As regards three/four levels of *vāk* Bhartṛhari accepted three levels; *paśyantī*, *madhyamā* and *vaikharī*. *Parāvāk* is beyond the level of other three. It is very subtle and also beyond the level of other three. At the same time it is beyond the reach of sense-organs. Only the aspirants of higher level can realise It, identical with *śabdabrahma*.

Bhartṛhari propagated that words in use are specimens of *vaikharī vāk* but *sphoṭa* is internal (*āntara*). By the term *śabda*, he wanted to mean *dhātvarthaka pratipādikātmaka śabda*. According to Prof. Shastri commentators interpreted *Vākyapadīya* mainly from Advaita standpoint; to some extent they were influenced by Kashmir Śaiva school also. Philosophers of this system tried to establish *svara* (vowels) as *Bījabhūta kāraṇa*, while *vyañjana* (consonants) are its modification i.e. *kārya*. Bhartṛhari's main concern was to establish theory of *śabda brahman—vāgeva viśvā bhuvanāni jajñe*.

Then Prof. Shastri discussed on theories of creation, dissolution etc. As regards order of creation Upanisadic theory has been followed in the *Mahābhārata*; and the dissolution in reverse order has been discussed in the Pañcarātra śrama. At the time of dissolution earth (*ṛthivītattva*) gets dissolved in water (*jala-tattva*) which again is merged in the fire (*agnitattva*), air (i.e. *vāyutattva*) and finally in the ether (*ākāśa*); but as regards the *layasthāna* of *ākāśa* all the texts keep silence.

In course of his speech Prof. Shastri discussed five facets of *vāk* (1) *vaikharī* (placed in throat), (2) *upāṃśu vāk* (inaudible subtle speech), (3) *madhyamā* (placed in *hṛdayākāśa*); (4) *paśyantī* (placed in navel) and (5) *parā* (lying in *mūlādhāra*). At the time of dissolution, articulated heard sound *vaikharī* gets merged in the *upāṃśu vāk* (inaudible subtle sound), *upāṃśu* again dissolved in *madhyamā* i.e. unstruck (*anāhata nāda*), *madhyamā* in *paśyantī* and *paśyantī* in *parāvāk*, beyond all the senses and to be realised by *sākṣātkṛtadharmāno ṛṣayaḥ* only. This *parāvāk* is nothing other than *śabdabrahma*, the aspirant being conversant with this *śabda brahma* through the courses of meditation realises the Supreme Consciousness. *Vākyapadīya*'s concern is to reach this Supreme Consciousness from *śabdabrahma* through a mystic course of journey.

Vth Session (2.2.2008)

The 5th session of lecture series started with Vedic chanting by Pt. N.N. Tripathi. Speaker of this session was Prof. Shivaji Upadhyaya, whose topic was “Interrelation between Vyākaraṇa darśana of Vākyapadīya and Dhvanisiddhānta of śaṅkara”. Members of the presidium were Prof. Vayunandan Pandey, Prof. Kailaspati Tripathi and Prof. Bishwanath Bhattacharya.

In the beginning Hon. Coordinator Prof. K.D. Tripathi gave a short introductory lecture and told necessity of studying Aesthetics and Philosophy simultaneously. European scholars declared absence of Aesthetics in Indian Literature and thought; Hegel and his followers started to propagate this theory. The point is debatable. Still it may be said that through the study of (1) Kālidāsa's Literature, (2) Dhvani, and Rasa theory, and (3) Alaṅkāra śāstra it can be proved

that the stand of such scholars the view as holding absence of Aesthetics in India is illogical. However, it is true that a few traditional ācāryas such as Manu and Āsvaghōṣa, were allergic almost hostile towards Śṛṅgāra and this Aesthetics was based on love and exemplified through śṛṅgārarasa. Buddhists, Manu and a few others placed their antithesis to it. Monistic Śaivism and Acintyabhedābheda school elaborately discussed the aesthetic theories. Madusudana Sarasvati also enunciated this *Saundarya prasthāna*. Abhinavagupta in the beginning of *Abhinavabhāratī* explained the reason of exemplifying 28 *sāttvikabhāva-s* through *śṛṅgāra rasa*; and here he answered to Manu's challenge.

Next Prof. Tripathi raised some questions and expected these points to be solved through the speakers of lecture series. Bhāmaha did not accept *sphoṭa* nor the *vyañjanā śakti*, on the contrary he attacked it. Lollata was *utpattivādin*, Śaṅkuka and Mahimabhaṭṭa were *anumitivādins*. Bhaṭṭanāyaka was *bhuktivādin*. Only Nandavardhana accepted *sphoṭa* and *dhvani*. In his view *sphoṭa* is conveyed through *dhvani*. Abhinava himself even after discussing *rasa*, *saundarya* in details accepted *sphoṭa* and developed and established the theory i.e. *abhivyaktivāda*. Prof. Tripathi's question was to evolve a pervasive aesthetic theory. His second question was what is the difference between Western and Oriental view on the Aesthetics. The only similarity is, in Greece also *saundaryamīmāṃsā* starts from *nāṭya*.

Prof. Shivji Upadhyay, the main speaker of the session told that philosophy is permeated in Arts. Indian aesthetics is a vast thing and our *Alaṅkāra śāstra* may be considered a mine of the same. Defining *alaṅkāra*, he stated that *yatra yatra saundaryam anubhūyate tatra tatrālaṅkāraḥ, yatra tannāsti tatra alaṅkārabhāvaḥ*. Next he quoted the definition of *Upamālaṅkāra* given by Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha: “*sadṛśyam sundaram vākyārthopaskāraḥ upamālaṅkāritiḥ*” and told here *upaskāryopaskāra* relation is established. He confessed that there are different schools and traditions among our rhetoricians, but their purpose was not to contradict each other but to analyse *rasa* and *saundarya* in different ways. Because in his words every query begins with nothing and ends in struggle for supremacy. In course of his lecture he told that *śāstras* are of two types *lakṣyamukhin* (aiming at target) and *lakṣaṇamukhin* (aiming at giving definitions) and he remarked, former speaker Prof. Tripathi's introductory speech as *lakṣyamukhī*. In continuation of his

speech he stated that in every case *sūtrakāra* opens a new direction through abridged *sūtras*, while explanation and analysis is the task of commentators. He described *sūtrasāstra* as a slender rivulet in its beginning and commentary, gloss etc. are its expanded forms.

With this introduction he delivered his own topic “Inter-relation between Vyākaraṇa darśana and Dhvanisiddhānta of Ānandavardhana”. Because of vastness of both the sides presented his own view in the form of twenty-five verses, which he named as “*śabdabrahmavimarśaḥ*”. He started with *śāstram śāstrānubandhitvāt*—according to this rule all the *śāstras* are interrelated and this formula fits in the case of *Vyākaraṇadarśana* and *dhvanidarśana* also. He defined *Vyākaraṇadarśana* as the system where *śabda* is established as *brahma*, the Supreme Principle. Why is it termed as *śabdabrahma*? It is under the camouflage of *avidyā*, *brahman* devoid of all the attributes and limitations is designated as *śabdabrahma*. According to the *ṭikākāra*: in *brahma* there are two facets higher and lower. The higher one is described as *sānta*, *vikalpātīta* and *avikriya* whereas the lower one is *śabdabrahma* which is described as omniscient, omnipotent, qualified, etc. The same is named as *para* and *apara brahma*. In the first case there is total absence of attributes, limitations, efficacy and manifestation whereas in the latter, attributes, limits, efficacy everything is there i.e. *śabdabrahma*. That is why *para* and *apara* two separate facets have been assigned to them.

Now, the question is, at the same time how the same *brahman* becomes twofold? The commentator answers: *kalāvachchedakatvāt viśayabhedācca sambhavati*; because of being particularised by time and difference of objects it has been possible. He described *sphoṭa* as *śabdabrahma* pertaining to both *śabda* and *artha*. On account of its being both the *kārya* and *kāraṇa*, it is manifested as *śabda* and *artha*. Although the *Śabdamañjuṣā* under the *Brahmanirūpaṇa prakaraṇa* interprets it otherwise and Nāgeśabhaṭṭa has interpreted it from the standpoint of *āgamas*. Even *śabdabrahman* propounded by Nāgeśa and that by Bhartṛhari is different. As regards *brahmādvaita* and *śabdādvaita*, basically they are same, only difference is in the style of presentation. Prof. Upadhyaya described it as *śailīśailūsinṛtya*.

According to the Raseśvara school—*rasa* is the Ultimate theory. Although the *saundarya* propounded by the aesthetes has not been uttered here distinctly, the main subject is same in both the schools. The *śāstra* may designate it by different names *śabdabrahma*, *rasabrahma*, *rūpabrahma*—but all these are essence of aesthetics. In fact Upanisadic *brahma*, one and the same, devoid of all limitations has been explained and elucidated in different styles. With the removal of ignorance worldly affairs disappear like dream. The aspirant attaining fourth stage becomes identical with It. Only the Absolute Consciousness is there.

The same Highest Principle under the limitation of *avidyā* becomes desirous to manifest. For this purpose, *kāla* and other three forces viz. *icchā*, *jñāna*, *kriyā* are necessary. Vṛṣabhadeva in his commentary says apparently they are separate but they are not contradictory to each other. Necessity of these *śakti-s* is to concretize the words (*kāryonmukhī kāraṇa*).

Vṛṣabhadeva in his commentary has shown three possible etymologies of *brahma*, “*bṛhattvena*, *bṛṃhitatvena*, *ca brahma*.” The levels of *vāk* viz. *paśyantī* etc. are evolved from *Parāvāk*. As because this *parā* is beyond sense-capacity, Helārāja established *paśyantī* as divine speech (*brahmarūpa daiivvāk*). Vyākaraṇa is not only the treatise of word-processing, Philosophy is permeated in it. In fact Vyākaraṇa is inherent in all the *śāstras*, it is described as *sarvaśāstra pārsada*. Because of its being root of all the disciplines it is interrelated with Alaṅkāraśāstra also.

Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi and **Prof. Reva Prasad Dwivedi** discussed many points on the same topic. Reva Prasad Dwivedi felt necessity of preparing critical edition of *Vākyapadīya* and other seminal texts of art. In his opinion, to show the variants of reading is very much necessary for the proper comprehension of meaning.

Prof. Vayunandan Pandey in his presidential observation told basically *Vyākaraṇa* is *śabdaśāstra*. Mīmāṃsakas accepted eternity of *śabda*, not the *sphoṭa*. Only Maṇḍana Miśra in his *Sphoṭasiddhi* established *sphoṭa*. Sāhityaśāstra discusses on both the *śabda* and *artha*. Dhvani as a concept is established by ˆ nandavardhana. But earlier rhetorician Bhamaha did not accept *sphoṭa*, nor did he felt any necessity of *dhvani*. Grammarian accepted *sphoṭa* for comprehending the meaning of *śabda*. Now which one is *sphoṭa*? Prof. Pandey told *madhyamā vāk* is

sphoṭa. Nāgeśabhaṭṭa explained it from Agamic view. He explained: just as a *saṃskāra* manifested in the mind originates another *saṃskāra*, similarly word uttered by the speaker strikes the air and creates waves of sound which reaches up to the ear of listener; this wave of sound or word-essence is *sphoṭa*.

In course of his lecture, Prof. Pandey told *parāvāk* lying in *mulādhāra* is only *saṃkalpakāra*, when it strikes *paśyantī* in the navel it is only in the form of air (*vayvākāra*)—which again strikes *madhyamā* in *hṛdaya* and creates a subtle sound, it is *sphoṭa* which finally strikes the vocal cord and comes out in the form of hard language or *vaikharī vāk*.

Prof. Pandey in his lecture discussed the interrelation of *dhvani*, *vyañjanā* and *sphoṭa* and their necessity. Then he focussed on the position of *śabdabrahma* in other systems of philosophy. Naiyāyikas accept only two functions of word *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇa* (the denotation and indication); they have no botheration about *vyañjanā* (the suggestion). Therefore, there is no question of accepting *sphoṭa* or *dhvani*. Śāṅkara established perpetuity of *brahma* and word. Vaiṣṇavites especially the Bhāgavata school accepted *śabdabrahma* as *parabrahma*. According to Advaitins, Emancipation comes from Self-Realisation which is identical with *Vāk*, therefore, perpetuity of word is established. But ultimately Śāṅkara rejected *sphoṭa* (BS I.3.28).

As regards *saundarya*, its specimens are lying scattered in various places of our literature, we have not to import it from Western Philosophy.

Prof. Kailashpati Tripathi, another member of the presidium told that *śabdabrahman* is discussed in the benedictory verse of *Vākyapadīya*. Here *śabdatattva* is described as imperishable (*akṣara*); the essence of this *akṣara* is *sphoṭa* and grammarian's purpose was to establish its perpetuity. Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* has accepted fivefold *dhvanis*:-

- 1) *dhvanati dhvanayatiti vā yaḥ vacakah śabdah, sa dhvaniḥ;*
- 2) *dhvanati dhvanayatiti vā yaḥ vyanjakah arthah, sa dhvaniḥ;*
- 3) *dhvanyate iti yo vyango'rtho, sa dhvaniḥ;*
- 4) *dhvanyate anena iti śabdarthayor vyañjanarūpavyāpārah dhvaniḥ;*
- 5) *dhvanyate asminniti, dhvanikāvryasyāpi dhvanitvam.*

This *dhvani* is conveyed through *sphoṭa*. To the grammarian connotation of *dhvani* is sound, but the rhetorician accepts it more broadly and he covers both the aspects word and meaning. Multiple meanings can be suggested through *vyāñjana*. Undoubtedly Śāṅkara's contribution is unique. Kaṇḍabhāṭṭa, Bhartṛhari, Nāgeśa by way of *śabdasaṃyojana*, *anvaya* and analysis of root-meaning presented two phases of *Vyākaraṇa*, *prakriyā* and *pariṣkāra* (the process and analysis). According to Prof. Tripathi *Vākyapadīya* belongs to the group of analytical treatise. *Dhvanyāloka* also belongs to the same. At the end of his lecture, Prof. Tripathi suggested to arrange a separate workshop on *Vāk* for thorough study of the subject.

Prof. Bishwanath Bhattacharya, the third member of the presidium started his observation with a quotation from Dandin that *śabda* is the only light which illuminates the entire world. At first Prof. Bhattacharya discussed a problematic issue, i.e. date of Bhartṛhari. Though it is a debatable point, it is possible to determine upper and lower limits of Bhartṛhari on the basis of some facts, like (1) It-sing, the Chinese traveller while giving his account in 690 A.D. regretted over his inability to meet Bhartṛhari who expired only fifty years back, therefore upper limit of Bhartṛhari should be treated as middle of the 7th century. Secondly,

In course of his lecture Prof. Bhattacharya said that purpose of *Vyākaraṇa* is to systematise language and to use words properly. Earlier rhetoricians did not accept *dhvani*. It is Śāṅkara who introduced it as the soul of poetry. He observed that the idea of *dhvani* as the most salient feature of poetry was getting a currency amongst the circle of literary critics. So he is known as Dhvanikāra. Dhvani is a technical term here, it is not any accidental acquisition.

He told that two meanings are there: explicit (*vācya*) and implicit (*pratīyamāna*). No body accepted this *pratīyamāna* (implicit meaning) so far. According to Dhvanikāra, soul of poetry is meaning which is relishing to the connoisseur. *Vyāñjanā* (suggestion) is another alternative word for *pratīyamāna*. Since the element of suggestion is common to both the *dhvani* and *sphoṭa*, rhetoricians accepted the articulate letters by the term *dhvani* the suggestor, (1) not only this suggestor word and its twofold meaning, i.e. (2) explicit and (3) implicit (*vācya* and *vyāñgya*), but also (4) the essential verbal power

(*vyañjanāvyaṅgyāpāra*) and also that which is given the name *Dhvanikāvya*—all these five have been given the designation of *dhvani*—it is clearly explained in the *Dhvanyāloka locana*.

As regards opposition, Dhvanikāra faced it in his own time also. The essential verbal power of word and meaning to determine the suggestive meaning is called *sphoṭa*, the same is termed as *dhvani* by the 16 laṅkarikas. Vyākaraṇa is described as *sarvaśāstrapāṛṣada*. Therefore in order to prove validity of own thesis Dhvanikāra with reference to the grammarians and on the basis of their similarity in suggestiveness, placed his own opinion on *sphoṭa* alias *dhvani* and its five varieties.

The *sphoṭa* theory shows the way from transitory mundane world to the transcendental Self Consciousness, from *vaikharī*—the harsh language to *parā*—the Highest Principle of *vāk*. This is the contribution of Bhartṛhari and herein lies the excellence of *Vākyapadīya*.

At the end of lecture Hony. Coordinator rendered vote of thanks.

Valedictory Session

The last phase of lecture series was the Valedictory session which started with *maṅgalācaraṇa* rendered by Dr. Smt. Swaravandana Sharma. Chief-Guest of the session was Prof. Pradyot Kumar Mukhopadhyay while Pt. Hemendra Nath Chakravarty adorned the chair of President. This session was co-ordinated by Dr. Sukumar Chattopadhyay.

In the beginning Hony. Coordinator summed up all the lectures of the entire series. Later on Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyaya rendered chief-guest's address.

Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyaya—In continuation of Prof. K.D. Tripathi's lecture, Prof. Mukhopadhyay stated that former speaker gave a background of this lecture series. Entire programme was (1) a continuation of previous lecture series arranged by late Pt. V.N. Mishra, (2) an effort of preservation and expansion of study and teaching according to the Kashi tradition, and (3) to establish a link between oriental and occidental thought and discipline on the Philosophy of Language which Prof. T.R.V. Murty wanted to be forged in 1964.

In course of his speech, he said that upto 20th century, University Departments (i.e. Philosophy) mainly concentrated on the study of *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna* etc. Later on study of word (*śabdabodha*) was added to the curriculum. With the launching of Computer, a new horizon opened in the study of Linguistics. With reference to this context he focussed on the remarkable effort of Philosophy Department of Yadavpur University, Calcutta. They published entire *Śabdattvacintāmaṇi* and its *Prakāśa* commentary edited by Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyay and Prof. Subharanjan Saha. After the launching of computer they tried to develop a machine-language also. According to Prof. Mukhopadhyay, the foundation of modern computer-language is Pāṇini Grammar and Bhartṛhari's philosophy of language. It must be admitted that computerised intellects were in ancient India even when computer was not launched. Pāṇini sūtras and the Sūtra Literature of all the schools are its greatest example. In Europe, study of language was limited within Descriptive grammar. After the thorough study of Pāṇini Vyākaraṇa, a new aspect was emerged i.e. generative grammar. Hence, for the proper understanding of modern linguistics study of Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa darśana is very much necessary.

Prof. Mukhopadhyay in his lecture also focussed on the necessity of interacting with scholars of other disciplines. In this regard effort of both Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan and MM. Gopinath Kaviraj was undoubtedly unique. But unfortunately it could not be fruitful. Because Radhakrishnan's way of approach was not fully *śāstraniṣṭha*. In Kavirajji's case, inattentiveness and indifference of contemporary scholars were responsible factors. However, to revive cultivation of *śāstras* correct translation is necessary. As because original texts are too difficult to understand, people are reluctant to their study. Sometimes, shortage of time, vastness of university curriculum, unavailability of competent *ācāryas* become factors for their reluctant attitude.

In his opinion for reviving cultivation of *śāstras* shastric works should be expressive, and accompanied with perfect translation. At the same time analytic style is required.

Prof. Mukhopadhyay told that during these three days all the speakers concentrated on propounding necessity and importance of *Vākyapadīya* and

appreciated it, but nobody refuted or challenged its theories. Then he raised a question what should be the correct expression for *Vyākaraṇa darśana*. In the Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophy (Grammar Volume) Ashok Akluzkar rendered it thrice in three ways, i.e. (1) Grammarian's Philosophy, (2) Philosophy of Grammar and (3) Grammatic Philosophy.

Prof. Mukhopadhyay in his speech, mentioned another important point, i.e. at the time of enumerating branches of learning be it consisting of four branches, or fourteen or eighteen, nowhere the word *darśana* is mentioned. It is the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* which pronounces the word *darśana* distinctly. Now the question is regarding insertion of this word in *Vyākaraṇa darśana*. He mentioned two/three essential criteria for a full-scale *darśana*; Discussion on 1) Supreme Principle, (2) theory of creation and (3) the way to achieve the Ultimate Goal of life. Each and every *darśana* should fulfil these characteristics. Bhartṛhari's treatise covers all these points sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly. For the clear comprehension of this theory of creation from *vāk/śabdatattva*, the aspirant should follow the descending route, from the mundane level to the Supermundane, from *Vaikhari* to *Parā*—which is possible by way of *sadhanā* only.

Pt. Hemendra Nath Chakravarty expressed his satisfaction over the success of programme and uttered blessing notes. The programme ended with a vote of thanks rendered by Dr. Kamalesh Jha.

Prepared by: Dr. Pranati Ghosal