**CONCLUSION**

_Vāk_ is the most fundamental principle in Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. The principle explicates the whole world into the relation of signifier and signified. In this theoretical structure language, thought and reality are in identical relation which may be defined connotatively as different principles but denotatively they are one. ‘Multiplicity in unity’ is the _icchātmaka svātantrya_ of the ultimate reality. _Parā vāk_ is that ultimate cause which brings the _icchātmaka svātantrya_ into multiplicity by the manifestation process. She completes the process of micro and macro cosmos through the five acts- _srṣti, sthiti, saṁśāra, vilaya_ and _anugraha_. The five categories of actions are universal, wherein every type of action must be included. From the philosophical point of view, the epistemological and the ontological event are incorporated into the category of the five acts. Thus, the _parā vāk_ herself is the highest-nonempirical-unconventional nature of language and gives the Kashmir Śaiva philosophy a unique position among the philosophical schools of India. The linguistic Kashmir Śaiva philosophy is significant to study the problems of philosophy of language, which is broadly interrelatedness of language, thought and reality. The debate starts with the most fundamental problem that language whether construction of reality or representation of reality. The philosophers of Western tradition have recognized this problem in the 19th century. Russell, Wittgenstein support the representative aspects of language while Saussure, Derrida accept the creativity of the principle of language. Indian philosophical schools like Buddhist, Mimāṁsā stand with the creativity of language. Nyāya explicates the representative nature of language. Kashmir Śaiva philosophy holds that language is the constructive as well as the ontological principle. Language is the independent agent, which becomes _upādāna kāraṇa_ and _nimitta kāraṇa_ i.e. efficient cause as well as material cause.

The Kashmir Śaivite Abhinavagupta explicates the functional as well as philosophical aspects. His place in Kashmir Śaiva philosophy is the highest
because he makes this philosophical school reach at its zenith. He belongs to the tradition of his illustrious Somānanda, the author of Śivadṛṣṭī, engages in the argument with the Grammarians regarding the position of paśyantī. He establishes that it is not paśyantī which is the ultimate vāk as the Grammarians hold. Parā vāk is the highest principle. The author of Iśvarapratyabhijñākārikā, Utpaladeva, first time mentions the ‘vimarśa’ in jñānādhikāra, 5th āhika, 11th kārikā. Abhinavagupta interrelates this vimarśa with the vāk as twin principle. As a synthetic philosopher, he assimilates, reflects and explicates whatever is coming down in the thought system of the Śaiva, Grammarian and poetician like Anandavardhana. Both Āgama and Nigama are his source of vāk principle. That’s why the parā vāk is not only related to the bhāṣā darśana, she is equally significant in the form of dhvani and nāda for the sāhitya śāstra (literature), aesthetics, music also. Thus, the study of vāk through the corpus of Abhinavagupta is more fruitful. He is the master exponent and his works enable us to understand the essence of Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. His texts like Tantrāloka, Tantrasāra, Parātriṣikāvivarana, Iśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśini, Iśravapratyabhijñāvīrtivimarśini, Mālinīvottara are worth to mention in the context of philosophy of language. Along with, the text Iśvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva is also significant to understanding the development of the arguments in Abhinavagupta’s Iśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśini and Iśvarapratyabhijñāvīrtivimarśini, which are the pure philosophical text books. The latter development of his theories is found in the Kṣemarāja’s independent texts and commentaries.

Abhinavagupta’s vāk philosophy is comprehensive in scope and explores the possibility for many open-ended questions. However, the philosophy of vāk is related to the Kashmir Śaiva philosophy in direct manner since the entire structure of Kashmir Śaiva is defined linguistically. Although, the term linguistic denotes conventionality, but it’s connotative meaning is used in Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. Thus, in this context, ‘language or linguistic’ indicates towards the
source and essence of everything, including languages also and that source is vak. Vāk is an ontological principle that is called tattva. She is the svabhāva or essential nature of metaphysical element Parama Śiva. The ultimate reality is itself involves in all fundamental functions (pañca kṛtya), which have been already explained. But involvement is not intentional, it is spontaneous. That's why the spontaneity is the source of ānanda, icchā, svātantrya, uḷāsa and so on. These terms suggest that srṣṭi arises from unconstrained, without premeditate effort. It is the natural impulse. It is not dependent on any other agency. It is the absolutely independent agent and does all tasks through its essential nature sakti. This śakti is the vāk śakti. So, wherefrom the truth is experienced by the Śaiva-śāstra, para vāk is present from that ultimate point. In this way, para vāk is omnipresent, omniscience and all-pervasive. But these characteristics are related to other elements also. Thus, vāk is so called, because it speaks of the object by superimposing itself on the object through unification, namely ‘this is this’. Abhinavagupta defines her characteristics thoroughly, some of them are: lokānugrahi, vimarṣamayi, paramarṣamayi (at the level of paśyantī), adesa-kālakalita, amāyiya, śabda śakti, paramārtha svabhāva, asāṃketika, ākṛtaka, svasamvīt, paramahāmantra, vīryasṛṣṭirūpa. At the ultimate point, para vāk is vimarṣa. Fundamentally, Parama Śiva is the samghaṭta (unity) of the prakāśa-vimarṣa. Prakāśa and vimarṣa as unified principle is the svabhāva of Parama Śiva. Prakāśa is related to the existence and vimarṣa is related to the experience of that existence. So this experience is the ultimate experience at the highest level. The experience is the form of ahamvimarṣarūpa and the subtlest form of para vāk. The experience is the ‘pure thought form’ of para vāk, wherein no srṣṭi is possible. Only the experience of ‘I’ consciousness is present in the pure non-conventional state. The vimarṣa is significant in the context of internal reality as well as in cognition. Para vāk is called svatantrya also, which shows her freedom. Para term herself signifies the independency. Para vāk, vimarṣa, svātantrya are the various names of the one ultimate śakti according to the contexts and functioning aspects.
Abhinavagupta keeps referring to the creative aspect of *parā vāk*. Even the entire *śāstra* is the explanation of her creativity throughout by elaborating the facts. In this context, *parā vāk*’s *tattvika rūpa* shows capability to extend. That extension is the manifestation of *śṛṣṭi*.*Śṛṣṭi* is nothing but the functioning aspect of *vimarṣana* and *ābhāsana* in unified way.*Vimarṣana* and *ābhāsana* are those aspects which integrate language, thought and reality. In the same manner, they are, respectively, the epistemological and ontological processes. Thus, the epistemological and ontological processes arise by the creativity of *parā vāk*. Fundamentally, epistemology and ontology are the internal and external outcome of her creativity. Epistemology is the *vimarṣana* and ontology is the *ābhāsana*. Both are shaped and named by the determinate cognition i.e. *savikalpaka jñāna*. In this context, *parā vāk*’s epistemology provides the base for the ontology, because ontology is the subsequent course of the epistemology in Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. The real ‘internal’ prepares ground on which the manifested ‘external’ rests.

*Vimarṣa, paśyantī, madhyamā, vaikharī, aham, pūrṇa jñāna, apūrṇa jñāna, nirvikalpaka or avikalpaka, savikalpaka jñāna* are the constituents of the epistemology of *parā vāk*. But the very first principle regarding the cognition is the *aham vimarṣa*, it is none other than *parā vāk*. The *aham vimarṣa* (I consciousness) is the *pūrṇa jñāna*. That *pūrṇa jñāna* is *avikalpa* or *nirvikalpaka jñāna*. In this manner, in her subtlest form *parā vāk* is the *aham vimarṣa rūpa avasthā*, which is beyond the time-space and causality. The creative *parā vāk* is pregnant with all *prameyas*, *pramāṇas*, *vācyā- vācaka* and so on. But from the next level of *paśyantī* she inclines to creation, which is marked by the power of will (*icchā śakti*). At this level also, the *pūrṇa jñāna* stays in its pure unified form, no disunity emerges but the seed of disunity is ripen here. By this stage, dominancy of *nirvikalpakatī*, still, stays. But from the level of *madhyamā*, *savikalpaka jñāna* in the form of *aham-idam* emerges with prominent position. This is the position of multiplicity. And at the last level of *vaikharī*, the referent is
also emerged. So, this is the process of nirvikalpaka to savikalpaka jñāna. 

Nirvikalpaka jñāna is basically the subtlest form of savikalpaka. Savikalpaka is the outcome of the saṃśleṣaṇa, viśleṣaṇa and anusandhāna. In this respect, there are another constituents also like smṛti, saṃskāra, adhyāsa, adhyāropa, krama and so on. Every principle is related to the parā vāk. Thus, the process of indeterminacy to determinacy passes from the levels of parā vāk. And parā vāk is present in the form of essence in all. That's why we grasp all knowledge in the unified form, because parā vāk is unified, when we speak a sentence which is made of groups of words, but after hearing the sentence, we understand meaning in the unified way.

The emergence of knowledge as it appears does not require of pramāṇas and prameyas. Only kartā or pramātā is inevitable, he, himself, becomes prameyas and pramāṇa, vācyā and vācaka. But he never loses his originality of agent. He always remains subject. Subject, always, is internal that is Parama Śiva. Now the question is that what is need of Parama Śiva in the context of epistemology of parā vāk? In reply- Parama Śiva is the pramātā. Without pramātā, epistemology cannot be developed. And pramātā is internal rather than external. Cognition process is also internal. So there is the unity between the cognition and subject. Thus, the epistemology of parā vāk includes the knower only. There is no space for knowable as well as means of knowledge because these are not separate from the pramātā. The extension of internal pramātā is the external prameyas and pramāṇas.

There is another aspect of epistemology of parā vāk that is about her pure determinate state. That is called prasiddhi or āgama. That prasiddhi is one of means of knowledge. So parā vāk is pramāṇa. Since prasiddhi is none other than parā vāk, she is the most valid means of pramāṇa. Pramāṇas are always related to the determinate knowledge because their ulterior objective is the vyavahāra in the world. In this form, parā vāk manifests herself as śāstra, where meaning is always important than words. Prasiddhi must not be contradicted ever
by any other knowledge or pramāṇas. She is the highest and every pramāṇa and śāstra of other tradition is incorporated within her. She is that means by which the ābhāsas are related with the savikalpaka jñāna. Relation of savikalpaka and ābhāsas is the most essential in the context of pragmatic world. This relation is the outcome of yojana. Yojana relates both of them. In that way, pure determinate aspect of parā vāk is called āgama śāstra. But these āgama śāstras are not related to the creativity of parā vāk in the context of empirical world. They interpret determinately but they are not the cause of determination. They are prasiddhi or āgama, while the parā vāk is the cause of determination. The determination is the vimarsana of the universal aham jñāna into aham-idam rūpa vimarsana that is purely internal. The internal vimarsana is the foundation of the external ābhāsana. Ābhāsa shines as related to the limited subject and appears every moment in a new form. How do these ābhāsas and determinate knowledge unify? This is the considerable problem, because one is internal and the other is external. For, the śabda is very life of this determinate knowledge. So, one word is used for one ābhāsa only, which is free from all association with other ābhāsas, such as ābhāsa of place, time etc. In that case, each word convey only single ābhāsa without conveying the idea of time or place etc. which are apt to impart their limitations. In this manner, parā vāk determines the ābhāsita world and manifests the internal reality outwardly. In that way, parā vāk is the cause who unifies the internal world and external world and maintains the harmonious relationship between them.

Parā vāk is the source of ontology also. The constituents like levels-paśyantī, madhyamā and vaikharī are the same for the manifestation process. These are levels of not only of the cognition process. Every development comes across by these levels. The levels are the universal format for the development or arisen of any process or substance or things. Here, development means emergence of name and form. Nothing is experienced or percept without name and form. Both share the relation of vācyā and vācaka. Both are issues by the parā vāk.
However, mālinī and mātrkā becomes prominent. Basically parā vāk presents herself into the form of mālinī and mātrkā. Both are the śaktis. In this context, parā vāk is parābhāṣṭārikā. Although mālinī is much closer to the tantric insight, but her relation with the 36 tattvas makes her the part of the ontology at the paśyantī level. Still, mātrkā is more important in this context, as she appears at the level of madhyamā. Both of them stay in the state ‘viśrānti’ at the parā vāk level. Mātrkā manifests herself in the form of 36 tattvas. The entire world is the expansion of śakti. mātrkā is said to be the source of all vidyā or knowledge assuming the form of vedanā or inward feeling, indicative of the spandana of śakti. Mātrkā presents the ontology of varṇas also, which are bifurcated into svara and vyāñjana. Svara and vyāñjana share the relationship of vācaka and vācya. The vyāñjanas are the expansion of the svaras. In this manner, parābhāṣṭārikārūpa parā vāk is the cause of ontology also, she assimilates the whole world into the form of mālinī and mātrkā

Her next important aspect is mantra. Here, mantra is not the linguistic or magical formula. It is the nature of the highest reality in the form of aham. In that sense, it is paramantra. The aham principle strengthens mantra and upgrades it by identifying it with the couple of prakāśa-vimarṣa as well as ontological principle parā vāk. Although, mantra is multidimensional concept, but its relation with the tattvas through the mālinī and mātrkā, opens the door for the ontology. Along with, its identicalness with Parama Śiva, postulates it with the metaphysics. The highest reality is addressed as paramahāmantra also. The paramahāmantra is paravāṁmaya and vīrya (potency) so, srṣṭimaya, has power to create. Even, the ontological principle parā vāk is designated as mahā mantra and svasaṁvedanārūpa aham-vimarṣa is delineated with mantravīrya. Mantravīrya is the quite significant concept since it bridges the gap between mantra and mantras and other side it makes mantras potential, otherwise mantras would be jumble of words. More than that, mantra, which is nāda appears into the varṇas or śaktis and presents the theory of mālinī and mātrkā. Both are related to the ontology of
sounds itself and they make themselves relate with 36th tattvas. Tattvas, which manifest as various ābhāsarūpa externally, are the named and formed by the indeterminate and determinate knowledge. On the basis of these fundamentals, concept of signifier and signified comes in light, which are identical in essence. As follows, the entire structure of mantra is one of the key concepts to elaborate the communicative elements. It is the ingredient for the sentential unit. Mantra supports the ontological existence of varṇa and proofs it as the most basic unit, whereas in the form of meaning-bearing unit, varṇa is accepted as the most basic. For the implication of meaning on words, it indicates the adhyāsa and lolībhāva, in all these process, theory of knowledge cannot be ignored. In that way, mantra is one of the causes for linguistic formula as well as linguistic world since it is identical with sabdamaya parā vāk. Mantra is the source of the many issues in philosophy of language, which seems completely discarded in the Western philosophy of language. Even, the study of philosophy of language by the theory of mantra is in itself an independent subject. However, the vāṇīka aspect opens the door for the sentential unit. It is in itself non-conventional, but its effect māyīya varṇas brings conventional language. Thus, the metaphysical and ontological status of mantra concept is the source for many ‘linguistic-philosophical’ problems. It is situated at the highest level as becoming the nature of parā vāk.

Parā vāk is the key constituents of the theory of meaning as well. Since the varṇas are accepted as meaning-bearing unit, the question is that how do we get meaning through the varṇas. Abhinavagupta throws many logical arguments to examining the varṇa as meaning bearing unit. Varṇas has ontological status in Kashmir Śaiva. There is one designation varṇa bhaṭṭārīka also in the context of highest reality, even parā vāk is also designated with such type of designation. Contrary to that, sentences, words have no ontic status. So, they are ābhāsīta rūpa. Parā vāk is that place wherein the varṇas are situated originally. At the time of manifestation, they appear. Same way, meaning also situated in parā vāk,
being identical with her. Meaning appears at the level of *paśyantī, madhyamā* and *vaikharī* respectively through the *varṇa, pada* and *mantra*, but listener listens this meaning into unified way, because meaning is *akhaṇḍa rūpa* in *parā vāk*. For revealing the meaning, *parā, paśyantī, madhyamā, vaikharī*- all is inevitable. Particularly, *parā vāk* is the most essential, because she is the active participant at every level. *Parā vāk* is present at all stages with her integral nature. Likewise, remained stages are pretty important since a man speaks something through *vaikharī*, ideates through *madhyamā*, experiences some indeterminate state through *paśyantī* and experiences inwardly some truth through *parā*. The levels can be divided into two categories of indistinct and distinct. The *parā vāk* and *paśyantī* is related to the non-distinct and *madhyamā* and *vaikharī* is related to the distinct. Thus, in term of distinction, *madhyamā* and *vaikharī* is prominent since it is the place where sentential structure is appeared as well as they are conveyable at external level. At both levels, meaning relates with the sentential units. Even, comparing to *vaikharī, madhyamā* is more significant. Everything is constructed at the *madhyamā*, so *vaikharī* is only an appendage of *madhyamā* i.e. gross speech is only external manifestation of what is inwardly mumbled in *madhyamā*. From the listening and speaking point of view, *varṇas*, which are basically *nūda*, or *dhvani rūpa*, cannot be uttered and produced or reflect meaning, although meaning is hidden inside. *Nūda* or *dhvani* belongs to the *parā* and *paśyantī*, where splitness is absolutely absent. Therefore, on both levels, theory of meaning is not discussed, as meaning is dependent on distinct letters, words and sentences. Nonetheless, root of meaning is situated in the *parā vāk*, since *sankalanaṇusandhāna* (hearing process) is also rooted in *parā vāk*. To understand the meaning, *parā vāk* is the most essential. Abhinavagupta asserts that *śabda* and *artha* are unified eternally. At the highest level, they become identical. On the question of convention, Abhinavagupta declares without falling in argument that *sāṃketikatā* comes forth by the *icchā* of *paramesvara*. *Īśvarecchā* is the *sakti* or *sāṃketikatā*. 
In this manner, Abhinavagupta examines the *parā vāk* as the creative principle. The enlarged aspect of creativity makes her as absolute-highest creative power, which is not dependent on others. She is the highest form of language. The whole world is the utterance, that's why the cosmos is established on the basis of *vācyā-vācaka* relationship. Thus, the world ontologically and epistemologically is expansion of *parā vāk*, the ultimate language principle.